The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLVII OCTOBER 1961 NUMBER 3

PICKING UP THE PIECES: NOTES ON THE NEW YORK THEATRE 1960-1961

Alan S. Downer

Sonner et patienter.
—Notice on gate, Pavillon Vendome, Aix-en-Provence

IN the first week of June, 1961, *The New York Times* celebrated the end of a theatrical season acclaimed on all sides as disastrous with a series of articles investigating all aspects of the American professional stage. Deploying as many reporters over the Broadway area as it customarily assigns to an international conference, it came up with a picture not dissimilar from its accounts of the global confrontations of rival ideologies. As every national interest professes ultimate dedication to the survival of the whole (usually called Peace), while practising only self-interest (usually called Principles), so each theatrical component spoke of survival and dedication to the whole (usually called Art) while demonstrating greed, avarice, and pride (generally known as Protecting Our Interests). And, as in international impasses, those who must foot the bill for both Principles and Interests are not statesmen or artists but taxpayers and playgoers.

An impasse on the international scene, if it does not lead to war, leads to suspended animation, a timid maintenance of the status quo; the taxpayer endures from crisis to crisis and breathes a sigh of disgruntled relief. Since the theatrical is at least as much as the political a history of human beings, it is not surprising that the *Times* report should have more than one familiar strain. There have been few periods in its long life when the theater has not faced an economic crisis, few periods when the enlightened self-interest of one or more of its components has not promised death to the whole. Yet the theater has survived as a business, as a profession, and sometimes as an art. And it is safe to predict that it will survive its present crisis in New York, though history also prophesies that it will be duller before it gets better.

During periods of suspended animation the theater has always survived on its actors, its producers, its technicians, and most play-going generations have had to do with a good deal less than total theater; they were content with

Mr. Downer, Professor of English, Princeton University, is co-founder and former chairman of the American Society for Theatre Research. His most recent books on drama are Recent American Drama, The Theatre of Bernard Shaw, *and a new translation of* Hedda Gabler. *He has just completed a European tour for the State Department, lecturing on American drama. This is Mr. Downer's fifth consecutive annual review of the Broadway season.*

performance. And since, at the present moment, the theater seems to be once again concerned with surviving, audiences will have to be content, as in all periods of anemic playwriting, with performance. If they are restive it will be in part because the last century of playgoing has taught them that a play should be something more than a performance, that is, a generalization often at variance with the facts of life. Higher costs have also helped to raise the critical standards of the average spectator. The luxury of performance without content is readily available from the television set at the cost of only a few minutes of commercial effrontery per hour. Somehow this seems more to be tolerated than the same sweet-and-sour nothingness at ten dollars a head. Forty million people tuned in on *The Little Moon of Alban* on TV; not one per cent of that number could be induced to see it on the stage.

Meanwhile, if plays are nipped in their try-outs or wither on Broadway, the musicals flourish, not because they are better than the plays, but because audiences are conditioned to accept them as performance. The anomaly between a spectator's willingness to respect the skill of an artist who spins a ten-minute specialty dance out of a vapid popular melody and his unwillingness even to watch Celeste Holm turn *Invitation to a March* into an illuminating comment on a do-it-yourself culture, can be credited largely to the era of progressive playwriting which seems for the moment to have come to an end. Henry Irving, after all, did not need to woo spectators in the plays of Ibsen, nor James O'Neill in Chekhov, though they were contemporaries. Skilled performers are more common than accomplished playwrights, and spectators who value the experience of playgoing will have to be content to settle for half until the playwrights emerge.

1.

The art of playwriting is more often in ebb than flow, and the chief difference between the last season on Broadway and the commercial season of 1860 in London, or 1760 in Paris, is the curious conviction which seems to dominate both sides of the footlights in a New York theater that only new plays are presentable. Outside the United States the commercial theater is not unwilling—is, perhaps, almost too eager—to draw on the resources of its own past. But when Edward Hubler, the Shakespearian critic, once demanded in a public meeting why the American theater was so reluctant to "go to the bank," he got no answer or evasive answers from the theater folk in attendance.

It may be a good thing that we do not have in our national repertory a Shakespeare or a Racine. The London stage is so self-conscious about the one that the frequent Shakespearian revivals have become contests in advanced jiggery-pokery among directors; the French stage is so pious about the other that critics fall to quarreling over whether or not actors have improperly elided syllables. British Shakespeare, on the one hand, is all too often a freak show; French Racine, on the other, is all too often a trip to the archives.

Yet, when the new playwrights fail to appear, it is economic, artistic, and moral folly not to take a look in the cupboard. Nor should revival be left solely to Off-Broadway, where too often the resources of the producing organization are not up to the demands of the play and where the audience is restricted to those already aware of the riches of the dramatic repertory. It is, however, unfair to deny to Off-Broadway credit

for a creditable revival; two of the memorable moments of the past season took place an uncomfortable distance from Times Square under something less than optimum conditions.

The first, the Phoenix Theatre's revial of *The Octoroon,* was perhaps the boldest. Dion Boucicault, we have been taught, belongs to the superceded gilded age of melodrama. Melodrama, we have been taught, is only for those semi-amateur occasions when audiences are invited to drink beer and hiss the villain and turn the theater into a debased parody of itself on both sides of the footlights. The Phoenix rather timidly justified its revival as part of the nation's commemoration of the Civil War which (as it has turned out) is not unlike justifying a revival of Rostand's *Chanticleer* during National Poultry Week.

Fortunately there was little timidity in the actual production. Boucicault presents an out-size challenge to the modern theater, not because of his sentimental, Victorian view of human relationships, not because of a moral code at variance with the macrocosm of Einstein or the microcosm of Freud. Modern American audiences have not found it impossible to adjust to the far stranger world-views of Periclean Athens or Renaissance London. The difficulty with Boucicault is more fundamental: he expects speakers to speak and actors to act as they have not been required to for many generations.

It is hardly novel to point out that the modern actor *behaves*; it might be more precise to say that he does not act, he reacts. All the tendencies of our theater and of our life have been against the convention of positive, instant, performance. The old chant of the Stage Manager was, Pick up your cue. The modern chant is, Feel it first, or Silence is dramatic. This is hardly the Dionian way. His characters speak their feelings and at length, and whatever is to be done must be done roundly without fumbling. Stewart Vaughan and the Phoenix company saw not so much a challenge as an opportunity. "We believe *The Octoroon* retains today what made it significant, moving, entertaining and above all, theatrical to its first audience in 1859," said the program note, and on that note they acted.

The resultant production discovered some qualities in Boucicault that the modern theater might reconsider before he is put back on the shelf. For one thing, it was good to hear a love scene in which the characters knew their minds and spoke them forthrightly, with the bedroom far offstage. It was refreshing to meet a villain motivated by a representative selection from the Seven Deadly Sins rather than pre-natal or adolescent trauma. It was novel to see actors fighting and pursuing and dying, and not merely eating and smoking and leaving doors open.

True, Boucicault expected his audience to expend a good deal of belief. The villain is trapped by an impossibly early Polaroid camera, but Father Ibsen, who kept up with the world, was a little vague about the social disease that brought on the denouement of *Ghosts.* The plot is almost resolved by the appearance of a happenstantially delayed and purloined letter, but even Wilde, in *The Importance of Being Earnest,* was not able to laugh his successors into abandoning that convenient tool. Boucicault provides an adjustable ending (in America the heroine drank poison to avoid embarrassing the hero and the audience with a mixed marriage; in the liberal-minded England of 1859 a happy ending was possible); but Maxwell Anderson made hash of the tragic theme of *Winterset* by devising an equally logical

escape for his doomed lovers in the movie version.

Fantasy, artifice, convention are a necessary part of the theater, even the theater of naturalism, and that play is hardly to be deplored which attempts to present side by side the ugliness which we have come to accept as the truth about human relations and the occasional nobility and gentleness we have been taught to dismiss as mere idealism. Such a combination is *The Octoroon* with the romance of Zoe and George Peyton, the generosity of Salem Scudder, the devotion of Wah-no-tee, played against the malignity of Jake McCloskey and the terrifying drama of the slave auction. *The Octoroon* may not be our truth, the truth of, say, *Raisin in the Sun,* but the statement is reversible. At any rate, at the Phoenix it was neither a museum piece nor a vulgar parody, and it suggests that for a similar company and director who know that style is not a matter of surface, of gesture, and who can see beyond the curtain of whatever is aesthetically chic, there is matter for honest theatrical experience in the forgotten successes of the past.[1]

To couple Boucicault with Ibsen would be to invite the sarcastic snorts of modern critics as well as the surly disclaimers of the shades of the two playwrights. Nonetheless in its gloriously unpredictable way, the theater thrust the comparison upon us. At the Fourth Street Theatre, David Ross, impressario and director, staged an illuminating revival of *Hedda Gabler* after a series of mishaps that would have discouraged the most indefatigable impressario and under conditions that would have caused the resignation of any director free to resign. The Fourth Street Theatre must be the worst auditorium in America for the staging of a play so dependent on naturalistic production. The cramped and badly ventilated audience area is bisected by a minute platform on which, for reasons of visibility, can be placed only the minimum of properties and a bit of scenery at one end.

Now Hedda was a woman who likes her distance, not to say her elegances, and to force her to live on this tawdry scaffold with dirt and cigarette ends only too clearly seen under the few pieces of furniture by the enveloping audience is to provide her with a motive for suicide more immediate than Ibsen's. Further, the modern audience has seen a good deal more of Hedda than Ibsen permits. She was an ancestress of Blanche DuBois, at once curious about and frightened of sex and society, but drawn with an implying rather than an explicit pen. Under the conditions of the production and the greater experience of the modern audience, Hedda should have lost her power to shock, or even intrigue.

That she has not suggests that four-letter ideas retain an impact that four-letter words quickly dissipate. This *Hedda Gabler* is a powerful, shocking play, though perhaps not quite as Ibsen may have intended. Anne Meacham, a last minute substitute in the leading role, is a small, thin, weasel-like image of pride, always under tension, moving with economy, yet with the economy of force not lethargy. Her first appearance, standing unnoticed for a moment at the end of the opening scene, casts a glitter of frost over the cosy domesticity of Tesman and his aunt. She enfolds Mrs. Elvsted with the efficient friendliness of a vampire locating the jugular. Even when Judge Brack has gained the upper

[1] Such reactionary conclusions may need further support. Perhaps this may be derived from the moving *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* starring Otis Skinner, produced by the Players in the 30's. Or *The West Indian* played in straight-face as part of the bicentennial rites of Columbia University. Those who came to jeer were charmed to stay.

hand, she gives no sign of recogntion, nothing to prepare for her suicide.

In his attempt to enlarge the dimensions of social drama, Ibsen has perhaps given Hedda too many motivations for her final act. There is the familiar Ibsen theme of the dead hand of an outmoded social code; she is inescapably bound to an intolerable bore; she finds herself in the control of an unprincipled bounder. The complexity disappears in Miss Meacham's performance. She moves across her inadequate little world like a time-bomb, ticking relentlessly, but never revealing the hour for which the hands are set. Like Carrie Berniers of *Toys in the Attic,* Miss Meacham's Hedda is a very modern figure of evil, both motivated and motiveless.

The special virtue of the present revival was that it did not treat the play as a revival. For the producer, it was a new script whose values were to be discovered by testing. It thus escaped two dangerous traps: the masterpiece trap, which turns a performance into idolatrous ritual, and the guthrie trap, which slubbers the heart of the matter with a hazard of new inventions. The design and interpretation of Ross's production even provided some compensation for the lack of scenery. For even if there are economic reasons for turning to the arena stage and a modern aesthetic of production (derived from Appia, Craig, and Successors) which talks glibly about the Theatre of Dionysos and The Globe and The Actor Unbound, it is not always safe to ignore the ancient principle that the theater is a total art and the playwright a total artist. When the human face is substituted for the mask, something is lost from a performance of Sophocles; when women were substituted for boys, something unmanageable was added to the performance of Shakespeare. Take away the settings from Ibsen and you remove one of the symbolic tools by which he communicated his meaning. Hedda's house is as important as Johannes Rosmer's or Bernarda Alba's. It is as important as Hamlet's inky cloak, or Joseph Surface's screen, or Lady Windermere's fan. It is too bad that it also costs money.

Where money is no object, in the musicals, it is still possible to experience scenic display as another of the treasures the theater has in its bank account. N. Richard Nash, who has in the past demonstrated his desire to follow the fashion in his Riggsian *Rainmaker* and his Ingeian *Girls of Summer,* followed Arthur Laurents (and preceded Inge) into the theater of song and dance with *Wildcat.* In terms of contemporary bookkeeping, he was only mildly successful, but this might be debited against a pallid score and an evasive plot, and more surely against the failure to exploit fully the tomboy sexuality and slapstick charm of Lucille Ball. Its potential, at least as entertainment, was displayed in two scenes to be credited to the director, Michael Kidd and the designer, Peter Larkin.

Scene one began in the plaza of a sleepy border town where a conventional little song to a sombrero was repeated so often by solo voices and groups that its rhythm compelled first one, then another of the loungers to dance it out, until the whole stage was filled with swirling skirts and flying hats, and the setting itself joined in a bounding ecstacy. Essentially the scene was another reiteration of the romantic myth of the southwestern frontier; theatrically, it was a quarter hour of the joy-of-living and not the combination of mere energy and noise which so often takes its place (as for instance in *Take Me Along,* the musical parody of *Ah, Wilderness!*) on Broadway.

In the second scene, the climax, Wildcat Jackson brings in a gusher during a fit of pique. It was a conclusion long foregone, yet the realization was beyond the most childish hopes of the audience. There were pipes and tubes and a bore and a derrick, and a great jet of steam followed by a spout of black oil which wound its way into the borders. David Belasco would have been delighted and Boucicault amazed. The delight and amazement of the present-day spectator, who after all can see the real thing in the films or on television, recalls once again the forgettable truth that "playhouse" is not only a house of plays but a house of play, that one of its legitimate functions is to gratify the human desire for pretending.

Not that the honors for scenic realism should be restricted to the musical theater. At least once during the current season, the legitimate stage dressed a demanding, multi-scened play in all the detail essential to the full projection of its central idea. *The Wall,* Millard Lampell's dramatization of a prose epic by John Hersey, is about many people, but it is also about a place. The Warsaw Ghetto, its solid actuality, its vulnerability, its destruction, is as much a vehicle for the play's theme as any of the cluster of incidents performed within it. Indeed, its very presence, its reality, helped to make believable incidents almost as incredible as the domestic melodramatics of *Titus Andronicus.* A young Jew accepts appointment as a Ghetto policeman thinking to aid his people; he soon finds himself, to save his own skin, begging his father to offer himself for deportation; on the father's refusal, he carries off the invalid wife of an old friend. A Nazi officer shoots a defenceless man before our eyes; a moment later he is giving money to Jewish beggar children; a moment after that he is callously selecting the latest consignment of candidates for the gas chambers. Such violent, inexplicable reversals are the fabric of the crudest sensation drama. But *The Wall* was much more than a shocker, or a somewhat dated piece of specific propaganda. The insistent presence of its world validated the inhabitants of the world, created an appealing and ennobling image of man struggling against his environment, the enemy without, and cynicism, the enemy within.

It is difficult to imagine that the play could have succeeded at all without Howard Bay's skillfully devised envelope. The epic, the panoramic, is a difficult form for the modern writer, partly because it is difficult to conceive a character of sufficient stature to dominate a sweeping action. Consequently, epic more often means thickly populated, and so it was with *The Wall.* To give the sense of mass suffering and mass resistance, Mr. Lampell displayed many lives involved in many ways and moods. But it then followed that most of the characters were only quick sketches, their experiences rather glimpsed than seen. Still, while regretting the resort to theatrical shorthand, the spectator must respect the author's desire to create an action whose size would match the heroism of his theme, and acknowledge the success, once the cast had been decimated by events, of the concluding movement.[2]

Here in the rubble of the destroyed Ghetto which the audience has come to see as the sum of all the victims, the disaffiliated hero and the deeply engaged ugly-duckling heroine find each other; here a small boy escapes to freedom. Conventional as these acts may be, the reality of place gives them freshened

[2] Mr. Lampell writes interestingly of the playwright's problems in "Bringing 'The Wall' to the Stage," *Midstream,* VI (1960), 14-19.

significance. To be sure, the theater is probably no longer the place to show "how it was"; the more flexible cinematic medium is better adapted to chronicle history and theatrical journalism. But the theater is still the best place to show human beings in reaction to events and to engage the cooperative understanding of the spectator. In the last part of *The Wall* the audience is led to recognize the potential heroism, optimism, positivism (the will to *will*) of the human animal. It is no longer the simple, superficial emotion of hating the Nazis, but the deep inner experience of admiring Man.

2.

Somewhat timid about going to its national bank, the American theater has been bolder in drawing on international funds. In the last few decades the result has more often than not been unencouraging, but a record of success elsewhere is a powerful persuader. When the native playwrights have little to offer, importations inevitably attract more attention, both for matter and manner.

To the matter first. The past history of Anouilh on Broadway would discourage any producer who looked hard at the record. But the sensational success of *Becket,* in Paris and elsewhere, plus the willingness of Sir Laurence Olivier and Anthony Quinn to head the American cast was sufficient to overcome the inertia of double-entry. The historic-religious subject, bustling about from scene to scene and country to country (often on horseback), looked like a refreshing change in a playwright ordinarily infatuated with the sound of his own quiddities.

Oliver Smith, in his designs, caught the sense of play superbly. His permanent setting was a kind of cloister which could serve as a church or a council chamber, could be masked wholly or in part by drapes, or altered by small set scenes trucked in from the wings. Processions, hunting scenes, councils in the field were conducted by actors strapped onto hobby-horses to which they were able to give more reality than to some aspects of their quizzically-written characters. In an uproariously funny return to early nineteenth-century methods of scene-changing, the Pope and a Cardinal were scooted on stage in their episcopal chairs, for a Punch and Judy routine which must be the most vicious burlesque of pontificial matters since *Dr. Faustus.* The production envelope would permit exhibition of the full panorama of history, precise focus of psychology, and formal projection of commentary.

Yet the play was not any one, or any mixture, of these things. It was, rather, a kind of intellectual game, perverting history (to no purpose), displaying character (with no more than a superficial attempt at psychological truth), discussing religious, theological, political matters (with no regard for contemporary relevance). *Becket* is another of M. Anouilh's toys which seems to celebrate the importance of being unexpected. Politically, the characters talk about collaboration, about the necessity of corrupting rather than crushing a defeated enemy. Theologically, the characters discuss the conflicting powers of church and state, reducing both to the most impure form of Machiavellianism. Morally and psychologically there is much discussion of honor, personal and public, and much advertance to love, homosexual and heterosexual. Any of these issues, given these characters and situations, could have made a gripping play. But M. Anouilh does not desire to grip his audiences; he persists in teasing them. His Archbishop is a man so self-conscious he lectures not only his

associates but himself at each stage of his progress. There is no mystery in him, only the steady march up the inevitable stairway to martyrdom. The progress is theatrically realized in one scene, the single day in which Becket rids himself of all his worldly possessions, yet the self-consciousness of the action diminishes the dramatic impact. Becket is too much the master of his own fate, moment by moment, or he becomes the master of it once he realizes what the fate is to be; he is, for just a second, appalled when the King makes him Archbishop, but he instantly and completely assumes the role.

At the end of it all—no surprise, in a playwright so trapped in the net of his own unconventionality—is the triumph of hypocrisy. Purity of motives, brutal butchery, martyrdom, the honor of God, all come to nothing. The King, having "sacrificed" in penance at the tomb of the friend he has killed, and thereby won the allegiance of his Saxon subjects, appoints one of his murdering Barons to discover the unknown murderers and punish them. The author has read his Shakespeare well; one could only wish that he had read T. S. Eliot with less admiration and more understanding. M. Anouilh is a man of the theater as Mr. Eliot has never been, yet one positive result of the production of *Becket* is an increased appreciation of the dramatic skill and human profundity of *Murder in the Cathedral.*

Admittedly this is an American view of Anouilh. The French theatre has long been interested in the drama of fun and games, possibly on the principle that the only way to make an essentially nihilistic view of human experience theatrical is to play with it, a version of the Shavian theory that if you can't get rid of the family skeleton, you may as well try to make it dance. Certainly the main aspect of the new wave from the Left Bank has been its dedication to fantasy, to music hall, to the grotesque. Beckett, Ionesco, Genet, the whole priesthood of the hollow laugh, have dedicated themselves to kicking mankind in the funnybone. Since this kind of sadism can with difficulty be sustained for a full evening they have for the most part offered their *horridible risu* in programs of grandguinol. But Ionesco has uncharacteristic ambitions; tiring of cellars and cafés he aspires to commercial success, and Broadway cooperated by producing his full-length *Rhinoceros.*

The Rhinoceros is an evening of great fun. The basic idea is bright, if familiar; conformist man becomes before our eyes a rhinoceros. But it is, persistently, a one-act idea. Ionesco can only repeat his perisodactyllimorphic joke until it becomes tedious. For a true poet of the theater, Giraudoux, for instance, the idea would be a point of take-off, an incident in a more significant whole. Ionesco is capable of improvisation; in his first act the conformist Jean explains how the hero Beranger can bring himself up to the expected standards of living against a contrapuntal parody of a lesson in reasoning between the Logician and an old gentleman. But he is also deficient in theatrical imagination: his permissive comment on the setting for the second scene of the second act begins, "If a less realistic, stylized décor is preferred. . . ." Any playwright who took his own moral view seriously would surely know that fantasy set in an unreal world is as expendable as Mother Goose. In the real world it challenges the spectator, demands understanding.

The success of the production in New York must in part be credited to the director, Joseph Anthony, and the producer-designer, Leo Kerz, who were wiser than the playwright. The audience was forced to believe in metamorphosis in the public square of a small French

town, with quarreling tradesmen, ladies fondling cats, and office workers clearing their Saturday night heads with Sunday morning pastis. The first appearance of the rhinoceros (via the PA system) drove the little community into an understandable frenzy. For a few moments the stage became a sports arena, with tables and chairs and groceries and cats flying through the air, a passerby shinnying up a lamppost and the Logician taking refuge in an ashcan. None of this business was in the author's script; it was the necessary contribution of the director.

Ionesco, like Beckett, is more of a scenarist than a total theater-wright himself, and composes for artists of superior craftsmanship and imagination. When such artists chance to be cast in his plays the results are happy beyond his deserts. Bert Lahr, with his burlesquer's comic invention, made *Waiting for Godot* into a Little Theater classic. Zero Mostel as Jean may have achieved the same thing for Ionesco. It is difficult to imagine a less skilled, less self-propelled actor carrying the same conviction, and indeed Ionesco himself clearly intended the transformation from man to beast to be accomplished with the aid of make-up and mask. Mostel used only himself, and the effect is not really describable: a hoarsening voice, hands clamped into hoof-like fists, head held low and angled as if it ended in a snout, blinking piggish eyes, animal yawp and rasping breath; the tour de force was so complete that when his face came thrusting through the bathroom door at the end of the scene, without the coarsened texture, the changed color, or the putty horn specified in the script, the spectator drew back with a sense of comic horror that perhaps even a real rhino barely restrained could evoke.

In matter, then, the imports had little more to offer than the local product. And often, as in the case of *The Rhinoceros,* they were rescued from dullness by a manner imposed by Broadway. Only one importation, liver, lights and all, brought a new manner to the New York stage; *The Hostage* introduced us to Joan Littlewood. Now to manner.

By itself, *The Hostage* is not much of a play, made up as it is of clichés recollected with avidity. It has a touch of O'Casey and more of the Stage Irishman, Pat and Meg instead of Pat and Mike, and a plethora of anti-British epigrams that Shaw at his worst would have edited out. The basic plot, when extracted, is minute and familiar. A young English soldier is held prisoner in a brothel while his captors decide what to do with him. The author seems to have intended the brothel as a symbol, like the ricketty music halls of *The Entertainer*; in an expository moment, one of the characters points out that "This noble old house which housed so many heroes was turned into a knocking shop." The play is a crazy quilt of familiar patches.

But not in the hands of Miss Littlewood. She has become a legend in the British theater, and her grubby little playhouse in the East End of London a necessary stop on any playgoer's pilgrimage. Apostle of Brecht and the principle of alienation, she has brought a slapdash vitality into a dramatic repertory that was dessicated by politeness, and has turned slovenly playwriting into exciting theater. A master of the carefully rehearsed ad lib, she has kept alive the art of the music hall with its easy transition from apparent informal comradery between actor and spectator to formal representation and back to informality. "He should have been shot," says an inhabitant of the brothel, and being told that he *was* shot, "Ah, the poor man. I will sing my song for him." This is merely adaptation to the legitimate theater of the old technique of

the songwriter making a personal appearance, "And then I wrote—"

Somehow, this crudeness is fresh and funny and even touching. A Littlewood production is a kind of circus, with every actor in his own ring. The rings may move together in various patterns, but the life in each is independent, even in conjunction with others. The director's ad libido yields an impression of the violence and bustle of life, of unpreparedness; yet everything is timed so that the lines of the action are always in clear focus. Like any great vaudeville turn, the apparent casualness and improvisation is the result of careful planning and great artistic resources. Like the vaudevillian, she is almost totally unconcerned with the larger symbol or metaphor. In the script the brothel may carry political or historical implications; in the production, it is only a brothel, or more specifically a platform. Things are either what they seem, or nothing much; they are seldom more than they appear to be.

Miss Littlewood is the creative force in her productions. Her fellow directors are either gentlemen-ushers, keeping the ceremony in its proper lines, or civil engineers of urbane renewal, bringing the classic slums into line with modern design and function. Miss Littlewood has little patience, that is, with the repertory *Hamlet* that preserves the classical 38 "points" or the 1961 Stratford *Much Ado* which is modishly and unreasonably Regency in style and meaninglessness. She presents an evening which is not so much a theatrical experience as a night out on the town, a little drama, more than a little fun, a brush with vulgarity, a few moments listening to the propagandist on his step ladder, songs, dances, and snappy patter. It is fresh and funny—once.

In her effort to avoid the clichés of the theater against which she works, Miss Littlewood has created a cliché of her own. The cockney musical, *Fings Ain't Wot They Used to Be,* which followed *The Hostage* from the East End to Shaftesbury Avenue, is only *The Hostage* restaged in Soho. The songs and dances are a little more extended, but the jokes and the characters and many of the situations are well on the way to becoming new stereotypes. The kind of theater Miss Littlewood has created suggests what might have happened on Broadway if John Howard Lawson's *Processional* had set a trend in 1925. Self-awareness may have more to do with Miss Littlewood's resignation from her London shrine than her more widely publicized dissatisfaction with pressure from the commercial theater.

For, *pace* Gordon Craig, the theater advances on its playwrights. The Kazans and the Littlewoods, the Mielziners and the Larkins, the Mostels and the Oliviers are great craftsmen. Perhaps the arts of the theater, the arts of production, have never been so assured in procedure as at present. Certainly audiences today see productions of classic plays more perfect in every detail than was ever possible in their original performances. But *Macbeth* is not alive today because Burbage was a great actor, or *The School for Scandal* because Sheridan was a meticulous producer. It would of course be folly for theaters or playgoers to hold their breath while waiting for a new Shakespeare or a new Shaw. Like all aspects of human endeavor, play production and playgoing must make do with what they have. But they must not confuse what they have with what they might have. The search for playwrights must never be slighted in the exploitation of what is available. Meanwhile those who would see the enchanted castle must ring and wait.

CONCERN FOR CONSENSUS

David D. Henry

PUBLIC discussion in America would be enhanced if it were characterized by the spirit reflected in the words of the wisest of the Founding Fathers, Benjamin Franklin, when he addressed the Constitutional Convention on the reasons for his support of the proposed document. The convention had finally agreed upon the form of the Constitution. It was composed and the vote was to be taken on Monday, September 17, 1787. Franklin had written out his reasons for his vote. His statement represents the combination of tolerance and concern for consensus which is the essence of democratic society and which should be regarded as a basic tenet in the lives of educated men and women:

> Mr. President, I confess that there are several parts of this Constitution which I do not at present approve, but I am not sure [that] I shall never approve them: For having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise. It is therefore that the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment, and to pay more respect to the judgment of others. . . .
>
> In these sentiments, Sir, I agree to this Constitution with all its faults, if they are such; . . . I doubt too whether any other Convention we can obtain may be able to make a better Constitution. For when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men, all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an Assembly can a perfect production be expected? . . . Thus I consent, Sir, to this Constitution because I expect no better, and because I am not sure, that it is not the best. . . .
>
> On the whole, Sir, I cannot help expressing a wish that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it, would with me, on this occasion doubt a little of his own infallibility—and to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument.[1]

Public debate of issues bearing upon the general welfare is a vital tradition in American life. Its first expression was in the town meeting where citizens in public assembly threshed out the problems of common concern. As society grew more complex, the debate was moved from the town hall to the state and federal legislature, to pamphlets, newspapers and periodicals, to the lecture platform. In our time, the forum includes the mass media—radio, television, magazines, newspapers, and widely distributed pamphlets and books.

As the channels for public debate have become more numerous and far reaching, so have the questions. All the old subjects of purely local concern are still with us, but now we also have the tremendous questions of survival in a world of international tension. And the topics range beyond those formerly considered the appropriate agenda of public discussion; they now include science, engi-

Mr. Henry is President, University of Illinois, and Chairman of the American Council on Education, 1960-61. He was formerly President of Wayne State University and Executive Vice Chancellor of New York University. He is a member of Delta Sigma Rho, Pennsylvania State University chapter. In his senior year at the University, he coached debate. His most recent book is What Priority for Education? *(1961).*

"Concern for Consensus" is a revision of a commencement address given at Duke University, June 6, 1960.

[1] *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, ed. Max Farrand (New Haven, 1937), II (rev. ed.), 641-43.

neering, space technology, education, economics, inter-continental missiles, the weapons of national defense, international diplomacy.

With the increased complexity of the issues to be debated by the American people, and with the involvement of mass communicattion, recognized procedures and standards of discussion which emphasize the public interest are more greatly needed than ever before. And what is the public interest? It has been defined by Walter Lippmann as "what men would choose if they saw clearly, thought rationally, acted disinterestedly and benevolently."[2]

For this quality more fully to apply to current public debate, group discussion, oral and written, should be influenced by people who believe in such a standard. We need voluntary moderators for the public debate of our time, and we should insist that education contribute to their number, their training, and their interest in establishing a standard of public discussion as suggested by Benjamin Franklin and as phrased by Mr. Lippmann. It is not too much to hope that such a standard be sought even in political seasons. We are reminded, however, by James Harvey Robinson, that "Political campaigns . . . paralyze what slight powers of cerebration man can normally muster."[3] The laws of restraint and sensibility should be applied to public discussion as well as the laws of libel or of personal responsibility. Unfortunately, the saying is too true that a great many people speak as they think, but more often.

It is to be expected that many people will look at public questions through the limited view of their own experience, colored by their personal interest in the outcomes of a decision. When this fact in human behavior is treated by the disposition of people to hear only what they want to hear and to generalize from specific instance, the difficulties in the way of resolving public questions through public debate are enormous. The situation is not improved by those representatives of mass communication who shorten the full report or who emphasize the conflict, the sensational, the human interest at the expense of clarity, objectivity, and completeness in the treatment of issues under discussion. We may expect popular commentators at times to exhibit the frailties of the ordinary human observer, but the results are the more serious since the "by-line" conveys a kind of authority. There are too many of the kind of expert described as one who is able to avoid all minor mistakes as he sweeps on to the grand fallacy.

Our national behavior has two characteristics which the thoughtful citizen will take into account when he is appraising public questions. One is a tendency to too much self-deprecation when things go wrong, and too much complacency when things are right. The other is an approach to public questions with angry argument, rather than in the spirit of problem-solving.

We witnessed dramatic examples of both reactions, after Sputnik appeared. In seeking an explanation of the upsurge of Russian achievement in science and technology and the lag in missile development in our country, there was, on the part of far too many, an unreasoned, irrational and myopic view of American past achievement and present strength. When the President of the United States tried to give an informed balance to this picture, he was accused of "whitewashing" and lack of realism. The mood became more rational only

[2] Walter Lippmann, *Essays in The Public Philosophy* (Boston, 1955), p. 40.
[3] James Harvey Robinson, *The Human Comedy* (New York, 1937), p. 259.

after the American Explorer was put into orbit. Since then we have been applying our resources to the problems of the space age in deliberate and thoughtful manner, having stopped the name calling and the search for scapegoats.

The voluntary public moderator is needed in the clarification of issues. He encourages an attitude of problem-solving rather than the advocacy of panaceas. He joins no pressure group. The so-called "pressure group" has its place in the democratic way, and is a constructive channel for group expression as long as the different pressures are in balance. "Democracy is a state of flux between pressure groups," said Will Durant. In the complexity of modern life, however, we must have some citizens who stand for reasonableness, judiciousness, and logic within the conflicting advocacy all about us. A public opinion, off-balance, rebounding from the shouting of partisans and those who use the propaganda of selected and slanted facts, does not make for civic responsibility. Arrogance of opinion belongs to those who have no responsibility, and it is characteristic of the pressure group and the uninformed.

Judge Learned Hand has suggested the importance of objective public discussion: "The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right." "I submit," said Judge Hand, "that it is only by trial and error, by insistent scrutiny and by readiness to reexamine presently accredited conclusions that we have risen . . . from our brutish ancestors; and I believe that in our loyalty to these habits lies our only chance not merely of progress but even of survival."[4] The nineteenth-century humorist, Bill Nye, phrased the point, "it ain't ignorance that hurts people so much as knowing so many things that ain't so." Ambrose Bierce put it: "A prejudice is a vagrant opinion without visible means of support."

In these times, we must work for a civic leadership dispassionate in its approach to public issues. We must seek to moderate the persistently quarrelsome tone in the discussion of public affairs. Without clarity of issues and problems, the public cannot find adequate channels of expression; the process of democratic appraisal is thereby modified. Disunity has always been the greatest threat to effective democratic action. Lincoln touched on this theme in his Annual Message to the Congress, 1862:

> We can succeed only by concert. . . . The dogmas of the quiet past, are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves. . . .

Too few people discuss public questions with a willingness to have a tentative position altered. Most are adamant, unwilling to acknowledge that there may be a position different from theirs or that there may be uncanvassed facts or arguments. "My mind is made up—don't disturb me with the facts." The same ardent advocate, when crossed, often will heap fire upon the critic and ignore his criticism. To draw an analogy from chemistry, a body of facts is a compound which has a neutralizing effect on the explosive properties of a contentious discussion. We often neglect this neutralizer as we stir up a brew dangerous without it.[5]

Where does education come in, when so many "educated" people jump into the fray of public discussion with less than informed opinions and with closed minds? The hope for consensus lies not

[4] Learned Hand, quoted in *The New York Times*, April 11, 1959, p. 12.

[5] Adapted from Samuel P. Capen, *The Management of Universities* (Buffalo, 1953), p. 180.

with the partisans and advocates, but with the trained minds of the listeners and readers. Every educated man will apply the standards of logic, reason, and scholarship and let his opinion be guided by the results. He will not conclude that the informed person is necessarily one whose opinions are just like his own. The truly educated man believes in critical analysis and he believes in independent judgment, but the educated man also respects the point of view of others, even that which differs most widely from his own. He is governed by facts and logic, not propaganda and emotion. He believes in fair play, not pressure and coercion. He respects law and order where many rely upon favoritism to get their way. He gives a large place to faith and idealism when many follow the precept that the end justifies the means. He knows that social progress is dependent upon the reconciliation of honestly expressed divergent points of view, while many live by divisiveness, indifferent to the larger good.

A hundred years ago, the historian Francis Parkman regretted that popular education did not produce a class of strong thinkers. Its tendency, he observed, was to produce "an excess of self-confidence; and one of its results in this country is a prodigious number of persons who think, and persuade others to think, that they know everything necessary to be known, and are fully competent to form opinions and make speeches upon all questions whatever." The remedy, he said, is "To direct popular education, not to stuffing the mind with crude aggregations of imperfect knowledge, but rather to the development of its powers of observation, comparison, analysis, and reasoning, to strengthening and instructing its moral sense, and leading it to self-knowledge and consequent modesty."[6]

M. J. Adler in his introduction to *The Idea of Freedom* makes the point that "To know only that side of an issue to which one is already committed is not to understand the issue at all; and to know only a few of the relevant points of view when many are involved is to understand it inadequately." Mr. Adler maintains that "cultural pluralism" and "intellectual community" are the most insistent problems of our time. To solve it, we must "discover the common ground which underlies differences of opinion and then . . . transmute their diversity into rational and intelligible controversy."[7]

In looking at public affairs, the voluntary moderator accepts these as boundaries of public discussion: (1) The idea at issue should be criticized, not its owner. (2) Each person in a discussion may have purposes as worthy as those of any other. (3) Arrogance of opinion is more to be deplored than arrogant behavior. (4) Rationalization is not logic. (5) Argument from partial or selected facts, without acknowledging the limitation, is dishonest. (6) One must beware of believing only what he wants to hear. (7) One should not be bound by the past but he should respect it. (8) He who challenges authority should be sure of his own authority to do so. (9) Social progress will be advanced more by consensus than by conflict. Each person may choose to be either a part of a problem or of its solution. (10) Participants in public discussion should seek to identify a public purpose and should be motivated by a public philosophy.

Prerequisite to motivation for consensus and moderation is a concern for

[6] J. Donald Adams, "Speaking of Books," *The New York Times Book Review*, November 22, 1959, p. 2.

[7] Mortimer J. Adler, *The Idea of Freedom* (New York, 1958), p. xxvi.

the public welfare, a desire to carry one's share of the common task. "The test of democracy," says Ralph Sockman, "will be whether or not in the long run the average man will live for the public good."[8] Public service includes more than public office holding, more than a public commission. It includes the service of those who seek to maintain integrity in public discussion. The responsible individual citizen, with an understanding of the contending forces for the control of the minds of men, is the hope for fulfillment in action of the democratic ideal; and with that understanding must go both patience for progress and compulsion to apply intelligence to the civic tasks of every day. "Perhaps the highest function of a public servant in a free and democratic society," says Walter Lippmann "is to preserve its oneness as a community while he fights the battles which divide it. . . ." He must never forget, "that after the issue which is up for debate is settled, those who took part in the debate must still live and work together."[9]

When vendors of the mass media insist that they observe the standards the public wishes to follow, educated men and women are challenged as to the standards which they have taken from their educational experience to apply to their own participation in public discussion. They should be conscious of what they expect as listeners or readers: (1) Urbanity or party spirit? (2) Reconciliation or division? (3) Objectivity or personal criticism? (4) Clarification or argument? (5) Rational analysis or shouts and slogans? (6) Sensational simplification or the full text? (7) Thoroughness or slanted selection? (8) Public orientation or one private, parochial, or personal?

Controversy has its place in the crystallization of public decisions. The search for truth is characterized by the free play of minds working upon one another. Strong men will sharply differ. But, in differing, they should behave as serious men going about important business with caution, thoroughness, and mutual respect, not as placard carriers in a parade or ranters on soap boxes. The great debates in our history—represented by Lincoln and Douglas, Jefferson and Adams, the Federalist papers—had such tone, quality, and character, and they contributed notably to the development of our public philosophy.

Educated men and women will not withdraw from the debate but seek to moderate it by the spirit of Franklin's consensus and Lincoln's success by concert. "There is a quality of graciousness in controversy that is a mark of a mature mind," says Harold Blake Walker, and it leads "to harmonious relations and creative cooperation."[10] If we follow the age-old admonition, "Come, let us reason together," we shall have a stronger America.

[8] Ralph W. Sockman, quoted in *The New York Times*, June 2, 1958, p. 21.

[9] Walter Lippmann, New York *Herald Tribune*, May 26, 1959, p. 18.

[10] Harold Blake Walker, "Tolerance Is a Sign of Mature Thinking," *Chicago Sunday Tribune Magazine*, June 21, 1959, p. 34.

IT WASN'T "ELOCUTION": FIVE PROFESSIONAL ORAL INTERPRETERS, 1900-1925

Nydia Joan Reynolds

PROFESSIONAL oral interpretation is not something new, although the practice seems to be undergoing a rebirth recently. Persons who make a profession of interpreting literature to audiences have been known ever since the time of Homer. In the United States several periods of prominence have been experienced by oral interpreters; one of these periods was approximately 1840 to 1875, and another was 1900 to 1925. In the earlier of these eras the professional reader was a well-known figure. This was the time when Charles Dickens toured the country reading from his own works, and many actors and actresses sat on stages and read from manuscript to large audiences. Notable among these performers were Edwin Forrest, George Vandenhoff, Mrs. Scott-Siddons, Charlotte Cushman, Fanny Kemble, and Adelaide Nielson.[1] Their readings were usually heard within the vicinity of New York City.

A wider audience was entertained by the group of interpreters who began to be known about 1900. These people were the public readers who became an integral part of virtually every lyceum and Chautauqua week for the next twenty years. However, the professionals (who probably took the term reader from the earlier group) did not become publicized in national periodicals because their appearances were confined chiefly to small cities and towns.

The lyceums consisted of a series of programs, lasting for about one week during the winter. Chautauquas were the summer counterpart of the lyceums. The Circuit Chautauqua was a system of cultural entertainments which were provided to a group of towns on a progressive schedule. There was an afternoon and evening performance each day. Frequently the afternoon sessions consisted chiefly of music; the evening sessions began with a short musical program which was followed by a lecture or oral interpretations of literature. Sometimes there were two sections in both afternoon and evening performances. Musicians, a lecturer, an oral reader, or another type of entertainer might be scheduled as a featured artist in any one of the four sections. The most basic kind of entertainment group which appeared on the Circuit platform was the Concert Company. Concert companies were generally composed of two to five musicians and an oral reader; the readers with these groups, however, were usually minor in importance. On at least one day of each Chautauqua week a major reader gave a complete performance unassisted. Some fifty of these major readers toured the country for periods lasting from six to twenty years.

About half of them presented full-length plays which they had memorized;

Miss Reynolds is Associate Professor of Speech, Dickinson State College, Dickinson, North Dakota. This article is based on her Ph.D. dissertation, "A Historical Study of Oral Interpretation Activities of the Circuit Chautauqua, 1904-1932" (University of Southern California, 1960).

1 George C. D. Odell, *Annals of the Stage*, Vol. IX (New York, 1937).

the others presented groups of short selections. Perhaps the most interesting of those doing short literary works was a small number of make-up artists—ten men and one woman. They engaged in the novel practice of applying wigs and greasepaint in the presence of the audience, meanwhile keeping interest with light descriptive talk. Upon completing each make-up, they stepped forward to present a monologue. The process was repeated several times during the evening. So adept did these people become at quick application of greasepaint and wigs that a coordinated program was presented with no waits. Occasionally, depending on the extent of character change, some of the performers stepped into a small booth on the stage or behind a screen for fast costume adjustments. However, this practice was more common during the earlier days of Chautauqua. For a few characters rather complete costume changes were made, but the goal was to make as much of a transformation as possible with as few shifts in articles of clothing as could be devised.

Seven of the men who gave short character sketches in monologue form were Noah Beilharz, Robert O. Bowman, Elias Day, Gilbert Eldredge, H. R. Manlove, Ellsworth Plumstead, and John B. Ratto. Elias Day was the outstanding man of the seven. Jessie Rae Taylor, who did male impersonations, was the only woman make-up artist. Three men who were still more specialized than the others were William Sterling Battis, Benjamin Chapin, and Sidney W. Landon. Battis was known as "The Dickens Man." He spent years in studying and portraying Charles Dickens' characters. Benjamin Chapin gave a full-evening impersonation of Abraham Lincoln in costume and make-up. Sidney W. Landon, giving another of the outstanding kinds of programs on the Circuits, impersonated well-known authors in a presentation called "Speaking Likenesses of Great Literary Men."

To illuminate the procedures of this group of eleven make-up artists, five of the most interesting are here described in detail: Elias Day, Jessie Rae Taylor, Benjamin Chapin, William Battis, and Sidney Landon.

Elias Day was the most influential of the men who did character sketches in grease paint and wigs. He was given credit for originating that type of program and for making an art of rapid make-up in the presence of an audience. Day called himself a *characterist.* A number of other impersonators adopted the same name.

According to Charles F. Horner, Elias Day "did about everything with the spoken word."[2] During his early career he was an actor; later he became an interpreter doing solo performances; still later he set up a school, The Lyceum Arts Conservatory, in which he gave private coaching to many other Chautauqua performers. Some of these people were well-known individual interpreters; others were in groups who presented plays. During the last years of the Chautauqua there were several sets of "Elias Day Players" on the Circuits.

For his own performances, Day wrote much of his material, depicting American comedy types. One was a sketch of a Kentucky gentleman, Colonel Fayerweather, which was called "Going Home." Other characters were Deacon Watkins; Schnitzelboomer, a Chicago alderman, giving "a toast to the Ladies"; and Danny.

[2] Charles F. Horner, *Strike the Tents* (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 37. Horner was manager of one of the large booking agencies, the Redpath-Horner Bureau.

Paul M. Pearson of Swarthmore College compared Day's characters with those of George Ade's in the play *The County Chairman*. Pearson also lauded Day's delineation of character:

> Though there is a wide range in the characters presented on his program, they are all individuals. . . . The characters do not suggest each other, nor do they show any trace of the personality of the artist presenting them. This distinction is not produced by the common resort of the unskillful, an exaggeration that shocks the common sense, but by means of the nicest distinction.[3]

Besides his other activities, Elias Day occasionally gave lecture-recitals; for example, on a Mutual Bureau circuit in 1916 he was the speaker of the afternoon with Rudyard Kipling as his subject. In the evening he appeared in his regular impersonation program.

The literature of the Circuit Chautauqua period reveals a tendency to accept Day as pre-eminent in his field. Whether he deserved his prominent place in the minds of his associates is worth considering. Some evidence that he did deserve it is found in letters and interviews with surviving Chautauqua people. From a perspective of thirty years, they almost invariably ranked him among the greatest interpreters appearing in the lyceum-Chautauqua. For example, Charles F. Horner grouped him with Leland Powers, Phidelah Rice, and Isabel Garghill Beecher. Louis J. Alber, manager of the Coit-Alber Bureau, said of Day: "Next after Powers, I think I would put him at the top as an impersonator, creator of characters, or teacher of the art. . . . He was a genuine artist."[4]

Day's stated purpose was not to stimulate appreciation of literature but to entertain. In doing so, he was apparently highly effective with his audiences. To know his manner of presentation requires further study. Some help is found in a few articles concerning him which appeared during the first half of his career. The very prominence which he was attaining caused some controversy concerning his ability and methods. Charles Sandburg, in an attempt to write an honest, descriptive analysis, considered Day's positive attributes to be tremendous and his shortcomings to be negligible. Sandburg, nevertheless, said that Day jeered at and defied all methods and ideas which did not correspond to his own. But these comments were made in 1907; as Day continued to study and develop, some of his methods and ideas underwent a change. However, even in 1907, while noting faults, Sandburg implied that Day's delivery was generally conversational.[5] Day, moreover, advocated the natural method of delivery. In a series of articles in 1918 on "The Art of Entertaining" he stated some of his principles:

> I do not think there is a school in the United States that does not claim to teach its students the so-called art of naturalness, which I shall call Realism. . . . Realism is an attempt to simulate *nature*—not to be it. It expresses emotions as human beings express them, it uses those tones of voice which are used by people in real life—to gesture as people do when they are unconscious of themselves.[6]

He emphasized, however, that naturalness was far different from simply being oneself. In fact, he made the statement that an audience could be made to feel an emotion through absolute technique without any feeling on the part of the interpreter. When several articles were written in rebuttal, Day admitted that

[3] Paul M. Pearson, "Portrait of Elias Day," *Lyceumite and Talent*, VI (March 1908), 8.

[4] Louis J. Alber, personal letter to me, December 27, 1958.

[5] Charles Sandburg, "Unimportant Portraits of Important People," *Lyceumite*, V (January 15, 1907), 77.

[6] Elias Day, "The Art of Entertaining," *Lyceum*, XXVIII (August 1918), 14.

he had made a misstatement. "I feel," he said, "but I do not let feeling regulate my work by intuition without technique."[7] That he did, indeed, feel and that he used his own feelings as a basis of technique is pointed out in another chapter of his "Art of Entertaining":

> Experience has taught me that it is impossible for me to imagine myself someone else. I can imagine myself in another person's position and circumstances and then act as I would naturally act in the same conditions . . . for instance: if my character is supposed to cry or express anger or fear, I do not attempt to find out how that character would express any of those emotions, but how I would express them; adding the physical incidentals such as facial expression, age, nationality, dialect and tone of voice, etc. I will have a natural characterization.[8]

Day attempted to work out principles by analysis of his own performances. Although he rejected elocution books, he gave credit to George Henry Lewes (*On Actors and the Art of Acting*) for background knowledge.

After the Chautauqua and lyceum period, Elias Day and his wife lived in Long Beach, California. His influence continued to be felt. He helped such radio performers as Gaylen Drake and Frank Goss. Others who were his students were motion picture actors Robert Mitchum, Hugh Beaumont, and Larraine Day. Miss Day chose her stage name in honor of Elias Day.

Another make-up specialist was Jessie Rae Taylor. She was unique as the only major woman interpreter in Chautauqua to use wigs and grease paint. For a woman to use make-up on the platform was a daring thing to do because of the prejudice held by the audience against the theatre. Another remarkable fact was that the main characters whom she impersonated were men. She was undoubtedly successful, however, since she appeared in Chautauqua programs from 1912 through 1932, the last season.

When she began her career, she considered her manner to be different from that of many other professional readers; she felt the need, therefore, to resort to costume in order to get recognition. The idea to do male characters resulted from the fact that she was often mistaken for a man in telephone conversations.

Exact information regarding the method used by most of the Chautauqua make-up artists and other interpreters in organizing their sketches is not available, but Miss Taylor described her procedure in an interview with me on May 29, 1959. She called her sketches original because she wrote the final draft herself. Nevertheless, all of them but the first two or three that she developed were based on manuscripts by other authors. If the scene she intended to use came from a larger work, she typed out all of the speeches related to that scene made by any character whatever. Then from those typewritten speeches, cut apart with scissors, she devised a comprehensible sketch—eliminating where necessary. Miss Taylor told me she never presented a character until she had worked on it at least six months, and then did not consider it finished until she had had it before audiences for an additional six months.

Her first character sketch concerned a grandfather; then she added a grandmother; then an old negro man. Eventually she devised enough sketches to introduce a whole family. Added to these were dialect characters, including Peep o'Day from an Irwin Cobb Judge Priest story. Other characters which she impersonated were: Uncle Zebe, the lecturer, Tony, Mike, Bridget, Judy, Reverend Hazzard, Mrs. Wiggs, Miss

[7] *Lyceum*, XXVIII (January 1919), 17.
[8] *Ibid.*, XXVI (December 1916), 17-18.

Hazy, Mrs. Dixon—the lady from Oklahoma, Tom Chilvers, the Clown, Ruggles, Mr. Scrooge, and Mr. Gribble.

Miss Taylor usually made costume changes during a quick dim-out of lights. Between two of her monologues, however, she made the transformation while pretending to look for a collar button which the first character had dropped.

In her repertoire Miss Taylor had no tragic characters. She made it a policy to avoid a tour de force. Some of her people were pathetic, some showed a homely wisdom, others were brought in simply for comedy relief, but none of them was complex.

An interesting comment about her characterizations came from a person in one audience who was a director of a studio school; she said in a letter:

> May I tell you how very deeply your work impressed me last night? I had heard that it was clever, but I had absolutely no idea of the sheer artistry of it.
>
> The verity of your characterizations is no less than astounding. All day I've been haunted by the memory of your forthright negro woman, your pathetic old man robbed of his boyhood, your calm Judge Priest—all of them—they pass before my eyes living and real.[9]

Jessie Rae Taylor performed for me a sketch of two characters that she did on the Chautauqua platform; they were an old man and an old woman. The old man came first. It was interesting to watch Miss Taylor assume the stance of an elderly man and change her clear, melodious voice to a falsetto. After the man had talked for a time, the woman came into the scene. During the dialogue that followed, Miss Taylor used only a few gestures and indicated the change of character by a slight adjustment of posture, mostly of head and shoulders. Her impersonation was effective; at the same time it was free of any elocutionary exaggerations.

As a young girl she was acquainted with the Delsartean methods which were practiced in America and which resulted in extreme exhibitionism by amateurs. Although she had some Delsartean training, she refused to be influenced by it. Later she avoided the Curry, Emerson, and other famous schools because she suspected that their training would be elocutionary in nature. Instead she studied for two years in Philadelphia with Mrs. Mary M. Jones. Mrs. Jones followed the policy of making suggestions but never of presenting a model for imitation. Although Miss Taylor later sought private coaching, she felt that she received only an occasional suggestion of value. She believes that she worked out her own technique, achieving a natural delivery in her impersonations.

Her philosophy of interpretation is revealed in her statements regarding purpose. She said that the underlying purpose of every character sketch was to stimulate thought; nevertheless, if the audience was not capable of responding to the thought, it had to be entertained. On the other hand, she would never give a program for the sole purpose of entertainment. "I could do better," she said, "when I had an intelligent audience; yet an interpreter must try to do his best no matter what kind of audience he has."

Since the days of the Circuit Chautauqua, Jessie Rae Taylor has taken as her goal "to make literature live" for high school and other audiences. Among her later impersonations are Louis Pasteur in his plea to youth; Ernst, the soldier witness from *The Road Back*; Mrs. Midget from *Outward Bound*; and

[9] Theodora Irvine, personal letter to Jessie Rae Taylor, May 12, 1923. Lent to me by Miss Taylor. The letterhead is "Studio of Theodora Irvine, Dramatic Art, Thirty One Riverside Drive, New York."

leading characters from *Goodbye, Mr. Chips*; *Pygmalian*; *Gone with the Wind*; *Juarez*; *The World We Make*; *Abe Lincoln in Illinois*; and others. Miss Taylor went into semi-retirement after 1955 at the age of seventy-six.

Another performer interested in influencing his audience through art was Benjamin Chapin, known for his impersonations of Lincoln. He began his portrayals after studying at New Lyme Institute in Ohio and several universities and, in the meantime, giving lectures and impersonating other characters on the platform. In 1902 he presented a Lincoln monodrama. Appearing costume and make-up, Chapin impersonated Lincoln and suggested to the imagination other characters—Mrs. Lincoln, Tad, General Hooker, and Stanton. His ideal from the beginning was to create a truly artistic presentation: "The art of impersonation is more than looking like a character, or imitating the voice and manner—it is getting into the spirit, it is doing and saying just what that character would do and say under the same conditions. . . . True art is above price or people. It must stand for itself."[10]

In 1906 and again in 1909 Chapin appeared with his Lincoln study in the form of a four-act play. First he tried out the play in several other cities and then opened at the Liberty Theatre in New York. The play was quite favorably received. A review in *Theatre* said: "Mr. Chapin's work in the titular character is well conceived and admirably executed. It is a genuine impersonation of true dramatic value."[11] Chapin, however, went back to the monologue form. In the summer of 1911 he toured on a Redpath-Horner Chautauqua circuit. The monologue was the form he was to use without exception before Chautauqua audiences.

Preparation to impersonate Lincoln involved years of careful study. Chapin talked with servants, statesmen, and others who had known his subject, and he read intensively. His costumes were authentic, and even the mannerisms exhibited were declared by old acquaintances of Lincoln to be remarkably correct. In 1909 General O. O. Howard, who knew Lincoln intimately, said that he saw Chapin's portrayal several years previously and was greatly pleased and deeply impressed by it. At that time he had only one criticism to make, that Chapin's voice lacked the vigor and power characteristic of Lincoln. But, he said, "Mr. Chapin's voice has developed with the years and tonight even the voice seems like that of my own Lincoln."[12] Mark Twain, too, expressed his approval. He wrote that in the beginning of the performance, Chapin seemed to be giving a good imitation of Lincoln but soon a miracle began: "By an imperceptible evolution, the artificial Lincoln dissolved away and a living Lincoln was before my eyes and remained there until the end."[13]

Newspaper reviews reveal that Chapin's Chautauqua audiences had the same kind of reaction; for example, a writer in the *Boone News-Republican*, Boone, Iowa, wrote, "His impersonations of the great president were vivid, interesting and lifelike." The reviewer said the voice and mannerisms were like Lincoln's, and added, "Chapin measures well up to the dignity of Lincoln and the audience sat enraptured during the

[10] Benjamin Chapin, "Little Visits," *Lyceumite*, II (November 1903), 273.

[11] "Before the Curtain," *Theatre*, VI (May 1906), 114.

[12] Quoted in "Chapin's Lincoln Should Be Presented in Moving Pictures," *Lyceumite and Talent*, VI (March 1913), 47.

[13] Letter from Twain to Chapin, quoted in *Lyceum*, XXIII (February 1914), 75.

long afternoon."[14] It seems apparent that the impersonator was able to submerge his own personality completely in his interpretation of Lincoln.

Chapin was said to have had a remarkable resemblance to the President he portrayed; however, his photographs (appearing in several issues of *Lyceum*, 1913-14, and *Dramatic Mirror*, 1917) do not reveal such a resemblance. Probably the likeness was achieved through outstanding skill in make-up. Chapin, himself, said that when he first began experimenting, he could not get his face to look like Lincoln at all.[15] Yet, eventually he was able to perfect his technique so that a photograph in make-up might easily be mistaken for an actual photograph of the Emancipator.

Lincoln was to his impersonator the most dramatic character one could choose to represent. Chapin felt the truly dramatic to be that which results in action because of a changed point of view. He wanted his audience to be persuaded to change their behavior to a higher plane of nobility: "This [to move to action], I know, is considered primarily the test and purpose of oratory rather than of drama, but the particular kind of dramatic portrayal which I present combines the main purposes of both drama and oratory. I aim to make the result tally with the purpose—bigger, nobler action."[16]

He tried one more medium for presenting the Lincoln story, motion pictures. In 1913 a short film called *Lincoln's Thanksgiving Story* was copyrighted. Nevertheless, it was not until 1917 that he was really successful in putting his films before the public. A cycle of four films—*My Mother, My Father, Myself,* and *The Call to Arms*—was booked to open May 27 at the Strand Theatre in New York. For these films Mr. Chapin impersonated both President Lincoln and his father, Tom Lincoln. In a review in the *Dramatic Mirror* the Lincoln Cycle was called a remarkable artistic success. Chapin told the reviewer that criticism of his performance would have been justifiable if his impersonation were so literal that it gave danger of unconscious burlesque. "Instead of placing undue emphasis on concrete details," he said, "I try to give an abstract presentation of the Lincoln personality. . . ."[17]

It is apparent that in 1917 Chapin had reached a new maturity in his conception of artistic presentation. He continued working on films until he had completed his cycle of ten. Although he was ill while doing the work, he insisted on finishing. He died shortly thereafter on June 2, 1918, at the age of forty-three.

Unlike Benjamin Chapin, who wrote his own material, William Sterling Battis interpreted works from a widely read author. Excerpts from several of Charles Dickens' books provided character sketches for an evening. Since he used only one source, Battis soon became known as "The Dickens Man." While he presented short transition talks, Battis applied make-up and appropriate costumes. He made an intense study of Dickens' characters. In prints from Dickens' day he found costume direction; other help came from critical sources and from the novels themselves.

On the platform Battis usually began with an impersonation of Charles Dickens. Then, in turn, would come such familiar characters as Captain Cuttle

[14] *Boone* (Iowa) *News-Republican*, July 16, 1912, p. 5.

[15] Chapin, quoted in "How an Artist Makes Up—An Interview," *Lyceumite and Talent*, XVII (March 1908), 57.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Allison Smith, "The Evolution of an Idea," *Dramatic Mirror*, LXXVII (June 2, 1917), 22.

in sailor cap and uniform; Mrs. MacStinger in shawl, apron, and bonnet; Mr. Micawber in red tie, fancy waistcoat, brown suit and cane. He also did Uriah Heep; Bill Sykes from *Oliver Twist*; Rogue Riderhood, the tramp; Sam Weller, Pickwick's valet; and finally Little Nell's grandfather in two scenes from *The Old Curiosity Shop*. In 1915, Battis brought out another character, Scrooge. This time he presented the whole *Christmas Carol*; it was in monologue form from the point of view of Scrooge.

"I am trying to interest people in good literature," Battis said.[18] He was to some extent successful in doing so according to several newspaper reviewers who stated that young people left Battis' programs eager to become acquainted with Dickens' works. According to a writer for *Billboard*, the interpretations were artistically done, not just clever impersonation, "but painting with speech."[19]

William Sterling Battis had training both as an oral interpreter and an actor. He was graduated from Curry's Boston School of Expression. Then for two years he was professor of rhetoric and physical culture at Colby College, Waterville, Maine. From 1892 until 1900 he was on the stage.[20] At one time he acted as understudy to Joseph Jefferson in *Rip Van Winkle* and later played with Clara Morris and James O'Neill in *Article 47*. When the Circuit Chautauqua began in 1904, Battis had already begun presenting characters from Dickens. By 1917 his services were in demand as a coach for individuals and groups who were preparing for the lyceum and Chautauqua.

That Battis was probably not subdued in his impersonations is indicated in numerous references to the strength and energy which he displayed. Yet his effective impersonations made him successful on the Circuit Chautauqua for fifteen years. He was also recognized in other media; in 1916 he made sixteen recordings for the Victor Record Company and followed these with a short motion picture for the Vitagraph Company.[21]

The fifth of the most interesting make-up artists of the Circuit Chautauqua was Sidney W. Landon. Like Battis, Landon had been one of Curry's students at the Boston School of Expression. He was also one of Elias Day's first pupils. In a two-hour program Landon would impersonate five or six well-known authors in make-up, interpreting selections from the works of each. For costumes he used a long-tailed coat with various collars and ties; he depended mostly on wigs and grease paint to depict his great literary men. His make-up was so skillful that the audience usually recognized the authors without any special announcement.

Landon impersonated Victor Hugo on his eightieth birthday as he spoke before the French mob. He represented Thackeray speaking before Parliament in his satiric discussion of the exclusion of snobs from society. As Mark Twain, he delivered the seventieth birthday speech. Then came Poe with "Annabel Lee." Bill Nye spoke on the American Boy. Longfellow sat calmly and talked of death and the burying ground which is "God's Acre." Some nineteen figures from the literary world were represented in Sidney Landon's interpretations.

[18] "Began with Joe Jefferson," *Lyceum*, XXV (October 1915), 32.

[19] Al Flude, "William Sterling Battis," *Billboard*, XXXI (February 23, 1924), 57.

[20] A. Augustus Wright, ed., *Who's Who in The Lyceum* (Philadelphia: Pearson Brothers, 1906), p. 64.

[21] *Lyceum*, XXVI (June 1916), 30, and XXVII (March 1917), 25.

Landon made a careful study of each writer before impersonating him on the platform. Many of the later writers such as F. Hopkinson Smith, Mark Twain, and James Whitcomb Riley, were known personally by Landon. Others he studied by going to their homes and by interviewing friends and relatives whenever possible. Newspaper accounts of his work usually carried the comment that his impersonations were startlingly realistic. Sometimes elderly men would come from the audience to tell him that he had brought back to life an old friend, referring to Mark Twain or Longfellow.[22] Charles F. Horner, manager of the Redpath-Horner Bureau, concurs in these estimates of Landon's exceptional ability to impersonate. He thought Landon was "vivid, magic—in the prelude to his characterization as he put on make-up and costume, he became as one transfigured, and his audience felt in the very presence of the character portrayed."[23]

Landon said of his own work that it required more than simply putting on a wig to be a success in the field of impersonation. "One must be a lover of literature," he said, "possess a keen conception of human nature, and be a student of his characters to such an extent that he forgets his own personality."[24] By his interpretations from well-known authors, he brought good literature to his audience. While he applied make-up, he helped the listener to understand by giving short expositions about the author's life and the nature of the piece at hand. He probably achieved considerable success in effecting a greater appreciation of literature among his audiences; statements to that effect are found in newspaper reviews of his performances. Louis J. Alber thought Landon contributed to appreciation:

> [He was] near the top as a favorite with me because there was an element of scholarship in his impersonations. . . . His "Speaking Likenesses of Great Authors" became a classic on the platform and appealed to the best educated folks in every audience. None his equal now in T. V. or anywhere else.[25]

In the late 1920's Sidney Landon became a member of the faculty of Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York; he remained there until his death in 1956.

Here, then, note has been taken of five professional oral interpreters of literature. They were representative of a small group of successful make-up artists. Some forty other major interpreters and many minor ones recited full-length plays or programs of short selections as they toured the country, winter and summer, during the first quarter of the present century. Those twenty-five years comprised one of the most active periods of oral interpretation in the United States.

[22] See "The Literary News," a printed collection of newspaper reviews of Landon's performances edited by W. H. Landon. A copy of "The Literary News" was lent to me by Mrs. S. W. Landon.

[23] Horner, personal letter to me, September 15, 1958.

[24] "Rise of the Wig and Greasepaint Club," *Lyceum*, XXIII (August 1913), 23.

[25] Alber, personal letter to me, December 27, 1958.

VOICE AND DICTION: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Ward Rasmus

LORD CHESTERFIELD once remarked, "The manner of . . . speaking is full as important as the matter, as more people have ears to be tickled, than understandings to judge."[1] This potent influence of speech delivery, which in large measure involves vocal usage, has been recognized since ancient times. The Greeks, absorbed in the study and practice of rhetoric and oratory, early discovered the importance of efficacious presentation in public speaking. Currently, voice-conscious Americans, influenced by radio, screen, and television, stress the need of a pleasant effective voice not only for those in the professions but also for those in the business world.

During the interim period between the ancients and the moderns, however, voice and diction, and general speech education rarely fused into a unity of purpose without some conflict. For instance, measures to improve the speaking voice have vacillated from general approaches lacking specific suggestions to disciplines which overpowered the whole of speech education. In addition, many systems have appeared in the training of voice and diction, some of which were bewildering and others conflicting. Even at the present time, authorities do not agree on such issues as (1) who should study voice and diction, (2) when it should be offered, and (3) how it should be taught.

The writer became aware of this situation several years ago when his assignment included the organization and teaching of college courses in voice and diction. In order to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past, he sought information which would provide historical perspective. Examination of available sources uncovered histories of public speaking, oratory, debate, and oral interpretation but nothing in the history of the core of all speech activities, the training of the speaking voice.

The general purpose of this study, therefore, is to discover the history of voice and diction training in order to understand and interpret the present and possibly to predict trends into the future. More specifically, it attempts to provide information on the following questions: (1) What underlying rationales have been dominant in the teaching of voice and diction? (2) What are the roots of current voice exercises and practices? (3) What appraisal can be made concerning the present and what prediction can be made regarding the future trends of voice and diction?

1.

During the Middle Ages and American colonial times, no rationale for voice and diction existed. In fact, with the collapse of the ancient world, stress on voice and diction all but disappeared. In medieval times preparation for the next world, indoctrination, and general austerity produced an educa-

Mr. Rasmus is Director of the Speech and Hearing Center, San Jose State College. *Some of the material in this essay is taken from his doctoral dissertation, "Conceptual Trends in Voice and Diction Training in American Colleges and Universities" (Stanford University, 1955).*

[1] *The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, with the characters,* ed. John Bradshaw (London, 1892), I, 353.

tional climate which stifled free expression; learning and education, relying largely on selected classics, became almost entirely bookish.[2] Since "speech" education in the modern sense did not exist, voice and diction received little if any attention.

The early American colleges, resolutely following the pattern of the medieval university, offered no formal vocal training. Instead, they concentrated on disputations whose formality and restrictions precluded effective training in delivery. Elevating the disputation—together with the Renaissance declamation—to a place of supreme importance,[3] they directed their efforts toward developing an ornate verbal style.[4] Speech practices, therefore, were traditional rather than rational.

During other periods of history, however, two philosophies have existed which motivated the development of effective voice and good diction. The first justified the cultivation of vocal elegance as an end in itself. This rationale originally appeared as Hellenic culture began to disintegrate. The Greeks and Romans had always considered good voice an asset, but during the decline of their civilizations they elevated ornamental and florid speech delivery to such a high place that it superseded speech content. Although it did not predominate until later, the Greeks' early general worship of "beauty" eventually extended to oratory, which they considered to be a fine art such as sculpture and painting. As the culture declined and the Greeks lavished more and more attention on beauty and ornament and less on substance, ostentatious speech and language came to be cultivated for its own sake.[5] In almost all respects, Roman attitudes toward speech matched those of the Greeks. In brief, the manner of speaking became more important than the matter.

Nineteenth century American speech education maintained a justification for voice and diction similar to that held by the Greeks and Romans during the decay of their cultures. Elocution became established as a discipline during the nineteenth century and dominated practically all American speech education until almost 1900. Voice and diction training, a nucleus of the elocutionary approach to speech, also flourished. During this time voice and diction enjoyed the greatest stress in American history. As elocution grew, it began to develop artificialities and ornamentations. This type of florid delivery achieved such popularity that display became an end in itself.

The second rationale has existed sporadically since the time of the early Greeks. It justified the development of effective voice and good diction if these enhanced speech content. During the heyday of both Greek and Roman civilization, prominent orators and speech teachers blended delivery and content so that good voice and articulation were part of effective communication. This rationale, as was mentioned, vanished later in Greek and Roman society. Although medieval educators disregarded ancient oratorical practices, some Renaissance educators renewed some of the concepts[6] and pointed out the impor-

[2] R. F. Butts, *A Cultural History of Education* (New York, 1947), pp. 161-183.

[3] James J. Walsh, *Education of the Founding Fathers of the Republic* (New York, 1935), p. 299.

[4] Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1936), p. 173.

[5] Butts, p. 108.

[6] W. H. Woodward, *Studies in Education During the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1924), p. 174.

tance of developing a good voice to enhance speech content.[7]

Today, speech education has adopted the latter point of view. This trend began in the late 1800's when such men as J. H. McIlvaine[8] and W. B. Chamberlain[9] began to revive the "natural" approach to voice and diction. Others, such as S. S. Curry and L. E. Bassett, followed later. Challenging the concepts of elocution and encouraging an unaffected delivery responsive to clear thinking, these men reasserted the rationale characteristic of the peak of the Greek and Roman civilizations. In other words, the followers of the "natural" movement justified the teaching of voice and diction on the tenet that it contributed to the effective expression of one's ideas. Present-day speech education accepts this concept.

2.

Since 1800 a number of vocal drills and practices have appeared and then vanished. Many ideas and techniques, however, some based on ancient concepts, have survived or have been modified and are currently in use. These fall into eight categories, which take into account the subjects of breathing, tone production (including pitch), quality, loudness (projection), knowledge of the vocal mechanism, general methodology, and diction. The roots of each are here reviewed.

Breathing. The Greeks and Romans early recognized the important relationship of proper breathing to effective speaking. The elocutionists, elevating respiration in voice training above all else, proposed scores of practices such as "inspire deeply," "take a large amount of air," and other exercises such as "chest percussion" and general calisthenics. Many practices disappeared as the status of elocution declined.[10] From this great stress on respiration, however, two groups of drills appeared which continue in use today. The first of these involves the control of expiration, a point which Quintilian[11] had mentioned ages ago; yet specific techniques for acquiring this control were not described in the literature before the late nineteenth century. The second group of exercises concerns diaphragmatic or "central" control of breathing. Because of conflicting investigational discoveries, authorities are still divided on this issue. Many teachers, neverthless, continue to have their students develop this type of breathing.

Tone production. Although some earlier writers had mentioned proper phonation as a necessary characteristic of effective voice, not until the 1800's did speech teachers begin to write about the importance of coordinating breathing and tone production. Before this time, authorities following "mechanical" precepts were interested primarily in the vocal effect. Around 1850, however, some of the elocutionists began to show concern for the processes involved in producing the effect. As a result of this interest, such empiric techniques as "whispering," and gradually phonating vowel sounds, and "yawning" to maintain "openness of the tone pas-

[7] Paul Monroe, ed. *A Cyclopedia of Education* (New York, 1913), III, 191, s.v. Bahista Guarino.

[8] J. H. McIlvaine, *Elocution: The Sources and Elements of Its Power* (New York, 1872), p. 120.

[9] William B. Chamberlain, *Rhetoric of Vocal Expression* (Oberlin, Ohio, 1892), pp. iii-iv.

[10] W. Russell, *Orthophony or Vocal Culture*, Re-edited by F. T. Russell, 79th ed. (Boston and New York, 1896), pp. 2-4, 40-41; Francis T. Russell, *The Use of the Voice in Reading and Speaking* (New York, 1883), pp. 18-19, 21-24; R. I. Fulton and T. C. Trueblood, *Practical Elements of Elocution* (Boston, 1893), pp. 32-33.

[11] *Institutio Oratoria* 11. 3. 1-60.

sage," developed, and although somewhat modified, have continued in use.[12]

Early twentieth-century teachers added further empiric drills, such as relaxation of the throat, the laryngeal musculature, the jaw, and the back of the tongue.[13] All of these exercises later received support from the investigations of the voice scientists who, in their study of the nature of vocal cord vibration and of vowel formation, showed that vocal efficiency reaches a maximum peak under conditions of relaxation and "soft surface" resonators.[14] Quintilian was the first to observe the important effect of a "soft and flexible " mechanism. This concept developed with the pragmatic experimentation of the elocutionists and became expanded under the scientific experimentation of the voice scientists.

The concept of the importance of pitch also dates back to the Graeco-Roman period. Recognizing the inefficiency of using too high or too low a pitch, ancient writers proposed the "middle" range. This general practice predominated until recently when voice scientists, relying in part on physical principles, developed the concept of the importance of locating and establishing the individual's natural pitch level (optimum).[15] In addition, voice scientists have evaluated the various methods of determining "optimum pitch." Many contemporary teachers also believe that locating this "natural" pitch level constitutes a basic step toward improving voice. Moreover, scientists have clarified the long prevailing and somewhat misleading idea of the "middle" pitch range. Voice training experts now recognize that the "optimum" is somewhere near the *third* or *fourth* tone above the lowest which the individual can produce clearly.[16]

Quality. Throughout most of the nineteenth century teachers generally developed vocal quality by means of imitation of models. Later, however, as the concept of the importance of coordinating and interrelating all parts of the vocal mechanism became recognized, voice teachers discovered that the same practices used for good tone production also resulted in good quality. Currently, most authorities employ breathing techniques, proper adjustment of the vocal folds, location of optimum pitch, and exercises which induce soft surface textures and those which produce vowels efficiently—all as means of developing good quality, an important product of all voice training. Voice scientists have provided a scientific basis for the application of many drills formerly used empirically by the elocutionists. In addition, the scientists have largely exploded traditional notions concerning the nature of the velar-pharyngeal closure[17] and the function of the "chest" in adding resonance[18] to the voice.[19]

Loudness. During the nineteenth century, vigor and force became prominent as essential vocal characteristics, presumably because of the necessity of speaking to large crowds outdoors or in

[12] F. T. Russell, pp. 39-55.

[13] Samuel S. Curry, *Mind and Voice* (Boston, 1910), passim.

[14] G. Oscar Russell, *Speech and Voice* (New York, 1931), pp. 65-66.

[15] Grant Fairbanks, *Voice and Articulation Drillbook*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1960), pp. 122-126.

[16] Wilbert Pronovost, "An Experimental Study of Methods for Determining Natural and Habitual Pitch," *Speech Monographs*, IX (1942), 111-123.

[17] Edward A. Nusbaum, Lena Foley, and Charlotte Wells, "Experimental Studies of the Firmness of the Velar-Pharyngeal Occlusion During the Production of the English Vowels," *Speech Monographs*, II (October 1935), 71-80.

[18] C. T. Simon and F. Keller, "An Approach to the Problem of 'Chest Resonance'," *QJS*, XIII (June 1927), 432.

[19] Raymond Carhart, "Infra-Glottal Resonance and a Cushion-Pipe," *Speech Monographs*, V (1938), 65-96.

large auditoriums. Force and "vigorous action" of the voice continued in popularity until the first decade or two of the present century, despite admonitions against vocal strain dating back as far as Quintilian's time. Twentieth-century teachers, however, apparently aware of the abuse which unnecessary strain can cause, began to develop carrying power by careful attention to such factors as breath control, relaxation (openness) of the throat and laryngeal areas, effective vowel formation, and clear articulation.[20] With the development of acoustical engineering, amplification, and the use of radio and television as primary media for speaking, the need for developing force or loudness no longer exists to the extent that it did.

Knowledge of the vocal mechanism. The important current practice of informing students about the structure and function of the speech mechanism started with some of the later elocutionists such as Fulton and Trueblood. Advances in physics, anatomy, physiology, and psychology have presumably added such support to this idea that most current voice teachers insist that students know how the vocal mechanism performs.

General methodolgy. The prevailing current methodology, then, follows the "natural" approach, revived and further developed by some of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writers. This point of view, reacting against "mechanical" practices, stresses the relation of thinking and "feeling" to proper vocal production provided the voice becomes "free" from inefficient functioning, loses any detracting characteristics, and can respond adequately to thought.

[20] Virgil A. Anderson, *Training the Speaking Voice*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1961), p. 70.

Imitation, stressed by Isocrates,[21] dominated methodology for many years. Although this practice has received less mention in the literature since 1900, it still exists in some instances. In general, however, the prevailing approach to vocal improvement has largely rejected the ancient practice of imitation in favor of a "natural" method, which, with roots deep in early English elocution,[22] emphasizes the idea that one has to think clearly before he can speak clearly.

Diction. Although the relation of thought to speech applied especially to the field of voice, it also affected training in articulation. The current approach to diction (articulation), however, also includes several practices in effect since the early part of the nineteenth century. In fact, records do not disclose any specific drills until elocution came into prominence. Traditional procedure during the 1800's involved some form of phonetic analysis together with drill on the formation of individual vowels and consonants, and practice on prepared word lists and on sentences.[23] Many teachers, using arbitrary standards of pronunciation, followed this general procedure as late as the first two decades of the twentieth century. In many cases, however, these drills became difficult both to administer and to follow because of ineffective ways of representing speech sounds and the use of obscure directions for sound formation.

Around the time of World War I, phonetic science had progressed to the extent that it clarified not only symbolic representation by application of

[21] Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet (Oxford, 1947), III, 46.

[22] Margaret M. Robb, *Oral Interpretation of Literature in American Colleges and Universities* (New York, 1941), p. 70.

[23] F. T. Russell, p. 25; Fulton and Trueblood, pp. 40-41.

the International Phonetic Alphabet and descriptive analyses of sounds, but also standards of pronunciation. The arbitrary selection of pronunciation patterns also began to decline in practice as elocution faded in status. Toward the end of the first two decades of the twentieth century, the trend toward "accepted usage" in the different American dialect areas as a guide to pronunciation began to supplant authoritarian precepts.[24] Currently following this pattern, the typical voice and diction course employs "drill" methods to improve both pronunciation and speech sound formation within the structure of descriptive phonetics. For example, many teachers, realizing the fallacy of the one-and-only "correct" formation of a sound, now use ear training as a means of establishing better discrimination and hence better enunciation. In other words, if the acoustic effect of the student's sound production corresponds to an acceptable standard, the specific manner in which he forms the sound becomes relatively unimportant. Current practices include phonetic analyses, drill on the formation of vowels and consonants, and the pronunciation of word lists and sentences within a framework of description rather than prescription.

3.

In describing the situation of today, one perceives that many of the ideas and procedures have come from ancient times, expanded and refined throughout the intervening centuries.

However, the contributions of voice scientists and phoneticians have deemphasized some of the procedures stressed in the past, have clarified certain other conceptions, and have added new ideas.

[24] J. S. Kenyon, *American Pronunciation*, 9th ed. (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1946), pp. vii-viii.

An appraisal of the current situation would be incomplete without a reiteration of three unsettled issues which have become focal during the last thirty years. First, the "science-art" controversy developed. Speech involves both "science," that is, classified knowledge, and "art," or the adaptation of knowledge to performance. In attempting to become "academic," speech departments tended to stress the former to the neglect of the "art" of voice training.[25] Second, representative voice teachers, administrators, voice scientists, and speech correctionists "overwhelmingly" agree that voice training at the present time still remains deficient[26] and has declined in status. Virgil Anderson summarizes this point of view as follows:

> Professional preparation in the field of voice training has apparently lagged far behind that of other areas of speech and drama. Since many can remember when the training of the speaking voice constituted the very core of any curriculum in speech, one may well inquire why and how such a situation came to be.[27]

Third, some believe that teacher-training institutions should give more attention to the voice and diction needs of future teachers, especially on the elementary level.[28]

An attempt to predict the future trends of training in voice and diction is hazardous. Some opinions regarding certain tendencies that may develop in the future, however, may be given with some degree of certainty. In the first place, the "science-art" controversy and the alleged neglect of voice training

[25] B. C. Van Wye, "Our Neglect of Voice Training," *QJS*, XV (April 1929), 202-208.

[26] A. B. Williamson, "Symposium on Adequacy of Training of Voice Specialists," *QJS*, XXXII (April 1946), 145-160.

[27] Virgil A. Anderson, "A Modern View of Voice and Diction," *QJS*, XXXIX (February 1953), 25-32.

[28] C. P. Lahman, "Speech Education in Teacher Training Institutions," *QJS*, XVI (February 1930), 42-61.

represent two facets of the same dilemma. In other words, speech education has relied heavily on the substance of science and on a "scientific" point of view to reaffirm its academic status. This dependence ultimately led to the "science-art" controversy. During the period of acquiring the "scientific" approach, speech education neglected the traditional "art" or technique of voice training. For instance, an examination of college and university curricula reveals that colleges for twenty-five years or more have offered graduate work in voice science and phonetics. Many of these schools have well-equipped laboratories in which students currently engage in important research. The typical graduate program, however, does not include courses in voice training or in methodology of teaching voice and diction. The absence of such courses would indicate that "science" still predominates, at least on the graduate level.

Secondly, it also seems likely that this lack of emphasis in the graduate level upon the "art" of training the speaking voice would partially account for the prevailing attitude that voice training suffers neglect. Since universities do not offer courses in methodology, prospective instructors have no way of learning how to teach "voice." Yet most speech authorities—and presumably many persons outside the field—agree that a pleasant voice and clear diction constitute assets to effective communication. Thus, the attitude seems to prevail that one who knows the *science* ergo can apply the *art*. Practice, however, does not seem to bear out this assumption. Speech education could at least partially resolve the problem by adding graduate seminars and methods courses in voice training for the purpose of familiarizing speech teachers with procedures to improve the oral skills of undergraduate students.

In the third place, speech authorities for many years have declared that teacher-training institutions should assume the responsibility of improving the voices of future teachers. It appears that some of these colleges are now beginning to meet that need, and perhaps an encouraging trend has started. In any case, most teacher-training institutions in California require some form of "speech clearance" for public school teachers. In other words, these students must attain a certain standard of performance in voice and diction before they can receive credentials. Many questions still need answers: "What constitutes an acceptable standard of performance?" "How should the speech of future teachers be examined?" "If deficient, how should speech be improved?" Despite the fact that these problems may remain unsolved for a time, it seems highly significant that some schools are now recognizing their responsibility for improving the voice and diction characteristics of future teachers and are doing something about it.

In summary, there should be a reorganization of the academic voice and diction program to include courses in voice training on the graduate level; this may help in solving the "science-art" controversy and take care of the present needs in voice training. Secondly, an encouraging trend has begun toward improving the voice and diction characteristics of public school teachers.

Four desirable trends have been here identified. In the first place, voice and diction teachers not only can but should develop techniques from pragmatic experimentation. In other words, as an inspiration for a new idea occurs, the

instructor should try it. He should not feel compelled to reject a procedure because "science" has not yet established its validity. Several nineteenth-century concepts, based on intuition or experience, not only have survived but at the present time constitute important methods for improving the voice. These measures include the establishment of the control of expiration, exercises to relax the pharynx and the laryngeal musculature, and techniques to adjust the vocal cords for efficient phonation. Indeed, from the time of Quintilian to the early voice scientists of the twentieth century, speech teachers had little to rely on by way of method except their own "hunches."

On the other hand, one can easily appreciate the skepticism of those who discard pragmatic training techniques on the grounds that science has not yet substantiated their effectiveness. For instance, it would seem far-fetched to a voice and diction teacher today to goad his students into practicing chest percussion and calisthenics to improve their voices. Scores of such techniques conceived by the elocutionists have long since vanished.

The danger of proposing inappropriate drills today, however, becomes comparatively remote because of the availability of scientific information concerning the normal functioning of the vocal mechanism. Teachers interested in improving the speaking voice should develop new ideas provided, of course, that they are not in direct conflict with scientific knowledge. If the application of these concepts produces the desired effect, research techniques can then evaluate their efficacy. Such studies as Pronovost's on the determining of natural and habitual pitch demonstrate the practicability of such a procedure.[29]

[29] Pronovost, pp. 111-123.

Second, voice scientists will continue to add new information which will assist training and will continue to re-evaluate techniques now in practice. Advances in instrumentation will no doubt afford more objective observations and measurements. For instance, the recent developments in electronics will probably afford more nearly accurate recordings and analyses of sound. Moreover, studies such as that of Huyck and Allen on diaphragmatic action have established patterns for scrutinizing training procedures.[30] Similar investigations will doubtless continue, and others will provide answers to such questions as the relation of breathing to voice quality.

Third, educators in general and speech teachers in particular will make progress in relating training in voice and diction to more effective communication. History has documented the point that when practices in voice and diction become separated in purpose from speech content, as they did in the decline of the Greek and Roman cultures and during the domination of elocution, they not only become artificial and ostentatious but they fade in importance. The natural union of delivery and content, first upheld by the Greeks during the height of their civilization, has been severed at various times. In fact, some followers of Ramist philosophy so effectively divorced the two that at least two centuries elapsed before they reunited with any degree of security.

Last, the trend toward broadly oriented communication courses recently begun will in all likelihood continue and may eventually blend all facets of communication including public speak-

[30] E. Mary Huyck and Kenneth D. A. Allen, "Diaphragmatic Action of Good and Poor Speaking Voices," *Speech Monographs*, IV (1937), 101-109.

ing, oral interpretation, discussion, and voice and diction into one entity. Each element of such training will contribute its bit toward more effective oral presentation of ideas. In other words, voice and diction as a separate undergraduate course in developing skills may disappear. If this situation occurs, however, proficiency in delivery would not be deemphasized but, instead, would be blended with other facets of speech education. In fact, voice and diction would still constitute an important discipline in the total process of communication and graduate courses in voice science, phonetics, and methodology should continue. It is hoped, meanwhile, that educators will unite all efforts to maintain the natural relationship between delivery and content—a powerful force germane to a democratic society.

Paul Shorey, former professor of Greek at the University of Chicago, in commenting in this journal about rhetorical theory said, "Somewhere in this vast body of ancient rhetorical literature you will find at least a hint of every useful idea that modern study of the subject has suggested."[31] It seems apparent that Professor Shorey's statement could also be applied to voice and diction. Ancient writers developed a number of very significant ideas concerning the effective use of voice, clarity of diction, phonetics, and voice science. Although some of these later became exaggerated and some of them were in fact erroneous, few would question that at least "hints" of many "useful ideas" had their roots in antiquity.

[31] Paul Shorey, "What Teachers of Speech May Learn from the Theory and Practice of the Greeks," *QJS*, VIII (April 1922), 105-131.

ETHICS OF GHOSTWRITTEN SPEECHES

Ernest G. Bormann

AFTER the television quiz show scandals of 1960, a story was circulated about the Senator who was so pleased with the reaction to a speech of his castigating the immorality of fixing television quiz shows that he raised the salary of his ghostwriter.

Whatever humor there is in this anecdote comes from the suspicion that ghostwriting is not much more ethical than quiz show fixing; the two situations are analogous. In the one instance the public was told that bank vaults protected the integrity of the questions; in the other, the speaker pretends to be delivering his own ideas in his own language. In both situations the effectiveness of the performance depends upon the gullibility of the audience and upon deception. If the audience does not believe the quiz show is honest, all the suspense is lost and the dramatic effectiveness of the show is dissipated. The producer tries to keep the public unaware of the hoax as long as possible. In like manner, the speaker tries to keep the public from learning about the ghostwriters who help with the writing of his speeches.

Even the hint that a speech is ghostwritten can detract from its effectiveness as this old story from England indicates. A member of Commons with a reputation for mediocrity surprised the house one day with a brilliant speech. As he concluded he was greeted by a surprisingly tumultuous ovation. When the sound died down, a voice was heard calling softly from the back benches, "Author, author." Much the same sense of deflation is experienced by the teacher of speech when a student delivers an unexpectedly brilliant speech in class and then there is a hint that the speech was actually written by the graduate student in English who tutors the football team.

It does no good to argue, as did the apologists for the quiz show deceptions, that television is just entertainment and so no harm was done, or that everyone knew the shows were fixed anyway. Everyone did not know they were fixed; an elaborate ritual was maintained to convince the audience that they were not. Similarly it does no good to argue that deception is not involved in ghostwriting because the speaker endorses the ideas by delivering them, or because everybody knows that the speeches are ghostwritten anyway. Everyone does not know that speeches are ghostwritten, and those who may believe it of public men they dislike still like to keep the fiction that their candidate writes his own speeches. Imagine the damage to the effectiveness of one of Mr. Eisenhower's television speeches if the closing credits read, "Produced by Robert Montgomery, written by Kevin McCann." Or consider the damage to the effectiveness of a television speech by President Kennedy with credits, "Production supervisor, J. Leonard Reinsch; speech written by Ted Sorensen."

Take the case of the speech student who honestly introduces his speech by saying, "I got this from an article in last month's *Reader's Digest*. My room-

Mr. Bormann is Associate Professor of Speech, University of Minnesota. A related article, "Ghostwriting and the Rhetorical Critic," was published in the October 1960, QJS.

mate helped me change it around a little bit and wrote my outline for me." Or the student who reveals, "I got this speech from the files of my fraternity. It was an *A* speech two years ago." Neither student will get an *A* with such an admission, but if the deception works, both may.

Because deception is inherent in the practice of ghostwriting, the ethical issues need to be discussed. There has been little justification for quiz show fixing, but ghostwriting has been rationalized since the time of the great ghostwriters of ancient Greece. Typical of one line of justification is this argument by an unidentified contemporary ghost writing in the *Christian Science Monitor:*

> There is nothing unethical about it. While it is the ghost's words that go out from the broadcasting studio or appear in neat blocks of type, it is actually the ideas of the signer of the piece. Or at least the signer thinks so—and he endorses them by delivering them. After all, is it more of a service that the ghost renders than an ordinary . . . stenographer gives when she writes the boss's letters deleting the various side-remarks and making grammatical English out of a jumble of words?[1]

The main defense of the ethics of ghostwriting in this argument stems from the notion that there is little real deception because the ideas are the speaker's, and because changing the language is really an unimportant matter equivalent to competent stenography. The ghostwriter is suggesting that the speaker adopts the ideas and makes them his own when he reads the speech. Applied to the classroom, this would mean the student who reads the speech of another is not deceiving his instructor because by the act of reading the speech he makes the ideas his own. As to language being a trivial part of speechmaking, there is a long and honorable tradition that sytle is one of the most important elements of rhetoric. Language is not a trival part of speechmaking; deception is involved in changing a man's characteristic mode of expression.

A more persuasive defense of ghostwriting is given by Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo W. Braden in their discussion of Franklin Roosevelt's speech preparation:

> In his own day, the one aspect of Roosevelt's speaking most often attacked by his critics was his method of speech preparation. There can be little doubt that Roosevelt called upon others to write almost in toto many of his minor efforts. . . . But it also must be recognized that Roosevelt planned, directed, and supervised carefully preparation of his major addresses. Moreover, before the address was finished much of his language and his compositional preference went into the speech. Roosevelt was directly responsible for what he said and how he said it. They were his speeches.[2]

In this defense of collaboration, the deception involved in ghostwriting is recognized but President Roosevelt's speech preparation is redefined so that it is something other than ghostwriting. Other writers were used to help prepare the major addresses, but Roosevelt acted as an editor with the result that he really wrote his own speeches.[3] They became his own and reflected his ideas and personality. If the speeches would have been similar without the use of collaborators, they were not ghostwritten at all and there was no deception

[1] "Ghost Never Tells," *Christian Science Monitor Magazine* (February 24, 1945), p. 5.

[2] Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo W. Braden, "Franklin Delano Roosevelt," *History and Criticism of American Public Address*, III, ed. Marie Hochmuth (New York, 1955), 528.

[3] Russel Windes came to much the same conclusion after studying Adlai Stevenson's 1956 speech writing staff. To the question of whether Stevenson wrote his own speeches Windes replied, ". . . one would almost have to reply, 'Yes, he did.'" Russel Windes, Jr., "Adlai E. Stevenson's Speech Staff in the 1956 Campaign," *QJS*, XLVI (February 1960), 43.

involved in his practice. The matter of the speeches that were written in toto by ghosts is a bit more difficult to explain away, but the attempt is made on the basis that they were "minor" efforts and therefore of little importance.

Robert Ray carries this argument of justification of ghostwriting to its logical conclusion in discussing the speaking of Thomas Dewey and Franklin Roosevelt in the campaign of 1944. He echoes the Brandenburg and Braden argument that the speeches were not really ghostwritten at all, but he goes beyond this. "Even among the readers of this article," he writes in *Today's Speech*,[4] "I doubt that any man who has a wife has failed to subject himself to her criticism of any speech he intends to present in public." He concludes that "if it is 'dishonest' to deliver a speech which another person has helped prepare then most speakers are to some degree 'dishonest.'" The fallacy of Ray's argument is to be found in the assumption upon which it rests, namely, that if a little bit of a practice is justifiable then a great deal of it must be as well. Using this assumption it would follow that if a small "white" lie is justifiable then so is continued wholesale falsehood.

Ray goes further in justifying ghostwriting. The candidates wrote their speeches with the help of others because, "to have expected them to do otherwise would be to have expected the impossible." Some duties have to be delegated. As Ray put it, "Now no one would expect a presidential candidate to carry his own baggage, make hotel reservations, engage halls and plan receptions." Or in the words of a businessman asked if he used ghostwriters: "Of course," he replied. "I don't shine my own shoes, do I?"

Here the argument that ghostwriting is essentially a trivial activity is pressed to its logical conclusion. There are more important matters that call for the attention of most influential people and therefore hired hands can and should take over the chore of writing speeches just as aides take care of making hotel reservations and getting the baggage from place to place. This argument is unanswerable. Given the assumption that speechmaking is in the same class as baggage-carrying, shoe-shining, or, to use an older comparison, cooking, then the delegation of such trivial and menial tasks to hired hands is certainly justifiable.

But for most rhetoricians this assumption is difficult to make. Donald K. Smith, in "The Speech-Writing Team in a State Political Campaign," although defending ghostwriting in much the same fashion as Robert Ray, tried to save rhetoric for at least one part of the intellectual community. He wrote:

> . . . it is impossible to conceive that men who occupy positions of institutional leadership either could or should take the time to originate the scripts for all their public pronouncements. College professors can do this and probably ought to. Most college presidents cannot; most politicians cannot; most leaders of industry and labor cannot. I question the tendency of some to imply that there is a moral problem involved in an activity as essential and inevitable as that of ghostwriting.[5]

This argument that anything that is essential and inevitable is therefore justifiable is somewhat questionable. Ghostwriting is an old profession, but there is another that is reputedly even more ancient that could be justified on these same grounds of being essential and inevitable. This argument can be applied to almost every form of anti-social activity. Graft can be defended as essen-

[4] Robert Ray, "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns," *Today's Speech*, IV (September 1956), 14.

[5] Donald K. Smith, "The Speech-Writing Team in State Campaigns," *Today's Speech*, IV (September 1956), 19.

tial and necesary to politics. So long as an unethical practice may be curbed by bringing it to light and taking a stand against it, the argument that it is necessary and essential and therefore no ethical judgment should be made about it will not stand.

Another interesting aspect of ghostwriting speeches is the double standard. Professor Smith accepts this; a college president may use a ghostwriter but a professor should write his own speeches. This double standard was graphically demonstrated in 1960 when the district attorney's office in New York City seized the books of a number of ghostwriting agencies in a probe of charges that college students and professors had term papers and theses written for them. Alex Benson, a newspaper reporter, posed as a ghostwriter and discovered that cheating scholars pay up to $3,000 to ghostwriting agencies for doctorates. He discovered that college students pay from $50 to $350 for term papers. He charged that one professor of a southwestern university had paid him $1,250 for rewriting his doctoral dissertation.[6] Oddly enough the State's attorney observed that the agencies also provided "legitimate" ghostwriting services for speakers. District Attorney Frank S. Hogan argued that the state education law made it a "misdemeanor to fraudulently obtain academic degrees or college course credit."[7] A few days later an editorial suggested an explanation for the double standard. "College degrees," said the editorialist commenting on the New York scandal, "are taken to represent honest, independent academic ability and achievement."[8] Apparently speeches by businessmen, governors, and the president of the United States are not to be taken as representative of honest, independent ability and achievement.

An ethical issue is plainly raised by the practice of ghostwriting. Russel Windes, discussing "Stevenson's Speech Staff in the 1956 Campaign" in this journal, wrote that Governor Stevenson "disliked admitting that any of his speeches were 'ghost-written.'" His dislike was based on a "perpetually itching hairshirt of morality. To Stevenson there is something deceptive in this process."[9] The grand jury that investigated the ghostwriting agencies in New York charged "wide deceit" and said that "the evidence shows [they] have resorted to unethical, immoral and illegal means."[10]

If speechmaking is essentially a trivial activity, then busy people such as presidential candidates and university administrators are justified in delegating the task. The primary purpose for employing ghostwriters is to enable the speaker to speak more effectively than he could without their aid. Since the effectiveness of the ghost-written speech is dependent upon deception, the ethical issue cannot be dodged by those who feel that speechmaking is a fundamental and important activity in a democracy. If the speeches are so minor that they may be written in toto by someone else, might not the person who writes the speech read the document as the personal representative of the great man? Could not the speaker himself say a few words extemporaneously without much preparation? If it is argued that he might say something unwise and cause widespread repercussions, then the importance of the occasion is assumed and also the deception, for if the speaker is given to saying unwise

[6] *The New York Times*, February 26, 1960, p. 1.
[7] *The Minneapolis Star*, February 26, 1960, p. 2B.
[8] *The Minneapolis Tribune*, March 7, 1960, p. 6A.
[9] *QJS*, XLVI (February 1960), 35.
[10] *The New York Times*, May 11, 1960, p. 41.

and unfortunate things when he speaks, this can be kept secret from the public by the use of a ghost.

To argue that major speeches can be prepared more easily with the aid of ghostwriters is to admit that they do most of the work. When the speaker himself takes an active hand in editing seven or eight or nine drafts of a major address, he saves very little time and he may indeed take more time because of his writing bureaucracy. The double standard is not very persuasive. If President Eisenhower ever did deliver a speech that was largely ghosted or if President Kennedy ever did, then are they not as liable to censure as the hapless professor from the southwestern university who paid to have his thesis made presentable?

For the speech profession this question is one of special importance. By precept and attitude and model, scholars in speech suggest ethical judgments about speechmaking. If they make light of ghostwriting and treat it as relatively unimportant, if they make sport of ghostwriting and treat it as a joke, if they suggest that ghostwriting is legitimate in certain contexts, they lend the weight of their authority to practices of speechmaking in our culture. Too often scholars in speech have condoned the widespread practice of employing hidden writers to deceive a gullible public by making a speaker appear more honest, more intelligent, more likeable, and more informed than he really is.

The essential question is: how much borrowing is ethical? This question arises frequently in the teaching of speech. The scholar needs to define clearly the boundaries of plagiarism and scholarship. There is a continuum of borrowing as there is a continuum in so many ethical questions. A speaker may give his speech to his wife and ask for her reactions. He may follow her advice or do the opposite. He may ask a friend to read the speech and straighten out the awkward places. He may have underlings prepare reports dealing with various aspects of the question he will talk about. He may find an outline for a speech in the files of his fraternity and take it from there. He may get his public relations counselor to research and write the entire speech which he then reads word for word as it was written. Somewhere along the continuum an ethical line should be drawn between dishonest and honest collaboration.

For students the place on the continuum may be somewhat different from that for executives and influential officials of government, industry, and labor, but this does not justify establishing a double standard. There would be little wisdom in telling students of speech that for now they must write their own speeches but when they graduate they can hire assistants, public relations men, and speech writers to do the job for them. The student who is supposed to be learning research techniques in preparing a speech can be expected to do more gathering of factual material than the executive who will be extensively briefed by aides and presented with memoranda and reports.

For a speaker searching for all the available means of persuasion who has an extensive research organization at his disposal, using some of the information compiled may be both wise and ethical. There is a danger in overdoing even this, for it is not wise for leaders to subsist on an intellectual diet consisting solely of predigested information. Presumably a leader in a field will have his own program of reading, discussing, and deliberating; he is a thinker, something more than a voice publicly reading statements of others. At some point on the continuum of collaboration the

place is reached where the speech changes character. The language becomes different from what it would have been had the speaker prepared the speech for himself with some aid in gathering information and some advice from friends and associates about parts that he should consider revising. At this point the ideas are different, the structure of the speech is different, the nuances of meaning change from what they would have been had this speech really been "his own." When this happens one of the primary functions of speech is corrupted. By means of speech man can experience what others have experienced, learn what others have learned, and most importantly, he can learn to know other men. In short, by means of speech one man's circle of experience can touch another's, thus widening both. But this function can only be served by honesty and integrity in the use of speech. If one man misleads another about his experience the function is corrupted. This corruption takes place when the style and structure of an individual's speech are altered by others.

If the audience is to know a candidate through what he speaks and writes, then he must be honest with them and present himself as he really is. When he reads a speech that reveals to his audience a quiet humor, an urbane worldliness, subtle and incisive intellectual equipment, then he should be that kind of man. If his collaborators, one a man of quiet humor, another an urbane worldly man, and the third a man of subtle and incisive intellectual equipment, are responsible for the "image" revealed in the speech, and if the speaker has different qualities and intellectual fiber, the speech is a deceit and it can be labeled as ghostwritten and condemned as unethical.

For those who work with graduate students, student debaters, and orators, the ethical problems posed by collaboration are exceptionally trying. As the thesis deadline approaches, a graduate student with a pregnant wife and a job hanging in the balance presents his graduate adviser with a thesis that consists largely of undigested data badly organized and poorly written. If the professor guides him, argues with him, makes him submit draft after draft, the student may write an adequate thesis but he will never meet the deadline, he will not get the job, and with wife and new baby to support, he will still be on the adviser's hands the next year. If the professor lets him submit the inadequate draft with the professor's name as adviser attached, the results may be equally disastrous. Would it not be just as good for the adviser to cut up the thesis, patch it together, and rewrite it himself? The candidate would usually be delighted. In ethical matters, however, one ought to be consistent. Inconsistency in this case may well be a hobgoblin that will return to haunt the graduate faculty.

What of the student orator with a sterling topic and a stirring delivery but who cannot seem to make the words flow or the speech fit together? Can the forensic director run it through his typewriter several times just to see how it will sound? If we impose an ethical standard on our students and on ourselves—if we believe in the importance of speech, we must impose ethical standards upon students, upon the president of the United States, upon the president of our college or university, upon our governor, upon the presidents of corporations and labor unions—upon everyone who presents himself and his ideas to an audience for its acceptance.

HARRY S. TRUMAN: SPOKESMAN FOR CONTAINMENT

William R. Underhill

IN the United States perhaps more than in any other country, foreign policies are announced, interpreted, and defended in public speeches. While it may be true that public opinion is not the sole or even the chief determinant of foreign policy, it is even more clear that no foreign policy can be established or maintained without the understanding of the American people. For this reason regular foreign policy reports are to be expected from the Chief of State.

No matter who the President is, no other person in the United States speaks with such authority and prestige. When he speaks, Americans as well as observers throughout the world listen and overlook the checks and balances inherent in a democratic system. Because the President is the official spokesman, listeners and readers tend to ignore the many other persons, agencies, and branches which help to formulate policy. James Reston of *The New York Times,* among other writers, refers to the President as America's Number One Voice.[1]

In the formulation of foreign policy since World War II, it is painfully apparent that the overriding issue has been that of dealing with Soviet Russia. Although thousands of public addresses have been given on various phases of this psychological and political struggle which began early in 1945, three particular speeches by President Harry S. Truman may have marked the basic change in post-war attitudes regarding the Soviets—a change that when completed had shifted from an attitude of uncritical cooperation to one of containment at nearly any cost. Later developments in the cold war can only be explained by understanding the shifts in basic attitudes that occurred during the relatively short period between 1945 and 1947.

For the first quarter of 1945 America's Number One Voice was President Franklin Roosevelt, and his Yalta Address given early in March of that year undeniably set a pattern that was to be followed by other official American speakers. In this speech, Roosevelt stated the two main purposes of the Yalta Conference: first, to bring about the military defeat of Germany, and second, to build a cornerstone for international accord after the war ended. It was the first of these purposes, the military defeat of Germany, which provoked most of the immediate applause,[2] but it was the second purpose to which the speaker gave most of his attention.

In discussing the progress made toward international accord, President Roosevelt reiterated the "lasting peace" theme and the same degree of optimism he had expressed in his State of the Union Message at the beginning of the year. He did reveal that some "local problems" had threatened to disturb

Mr. Underhill is Professor of Speech, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

[1] James Reston, "America's Number One Voice," *Propaganda in War and Crisis,* ed. Daniel Lerner (New York, 1951), pp. 314-15.

[2] *New York Times,* March 2, 1945, p. 13.

the peace and were discussed at Yalta, but he implied that these problems were caused more by lack of proper diplomatic machinery than by basic policy differences. He also expressed his conviction that the major Allies were never more closely united in peace aims:

> We argued freely and frankly across the table. But at the end, on every point, unanimous agreement was reached. And more important even than the agreement of words, I may say we achieved a unity of thought and a way of getting along together.[3]

It can be shown that the wide interest in the Yalta Conference, as well as the themes incorporated in the speech, plus the authority inherent in the office of the presidency, all combined to make the address one of the most important speeches on American foreign policy in 1945. In attempting to assess the reactions to the Yalta message, one is impressed with the generally favorable reception accorded it. The immediate audience sitting in the House of Representatives seemed to receive it with close attention, and a leading newspaper in America reported that "Praise Sets the Tone on Yalta Report."[4]

However, it must be noted that at the time it was delivered the speech did not reflect the existing international tension; in fact, it attempted to promote uncritical international cooperation rather than admit discord. That there was an official awareness of this discord and tension can be seen in a message President Roosevelt sent a short time later to Mr. Churchill. The correspondence advised:

> I would minimize the general Soviet problem as much as possible because these problems in one form or another seem to arise every day, and most of them straighten out.[5]

[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin Delano Roosevelt 1944-1945*, ed. Samuel Rosenman (New York, 1950), p. 547.

It is clear that the somber facts of history, as we know them now and as Roosevelt probably suspected then, hardly justified the optimistic interpretation that was presented in the Yalta Address. Judging from the speech itself, as well as from the reactions to it, there seemed to be a reluctance to discuss publicly the growing political differences between the East and the West. One must conclude that in view of the facts then available to the speaker and subsequently available to the public, the speech tended to suppress rather than reveal the critical tension developing between Russia and America. This tendency toward the suppression of differences was an inescapable legacy thrust upon Mr. Truman when he came into the Presidency.

President Truman's Potsdam Report, August 9, 1945

After the first shock over President Roosevelt's sudden death in 1945, there arose speculation over the man who was to succeed him. Could Harry S. Truman, this plain, rather provincial man from Missouri, occupy the same glamorous role as Franklin D. Roosevelt—world leader? The world didn't know.

At the time of Mr. Truman's advent into the White House there was widespread good will toward the Soviets—a good will that the Yalta Address had helped nurture. One sampling of public opinion showed the following response to the question: "Do you think Russia can be trusted to cooperate with us after the war?"[6]

	Yes	No	Undecided
December 1944	47%	35%	18%
March 1945	55	31	14
June 1945	45	38	17
September 1945	54	30	16

[6] *Public Opinion Quarterly*, IX (Spring 1945), 103.

Following the August conference at Potsdam, Germany, President Truman returned home to speak to citizens who wanted and expected to hear more about friendly cooperation with the Russians. In his Potsdam report the President attempted to meet these expectations, for in his speech he struck out boldly in the same direction of friendly, post-war relations as expressed in the Yalta address. He did mention briefly that a difficult problem was developing in Poland, but he reiterated the hope that "free and unfettered elections" would be held there as soon as possible.

Although Secretary of State Byrnes as well as Truman himself later stated that they had reasons at Potsdam to be pessimistic about future relations with the Soviets, this pessimism was glossed over. For example, Secretary Byrnes later wrote:

> The public at home did not have the clear view of Soviet ambitions that the President and I had got at Potsdam. . . . We had refrained, after Potsdam, from publicly expressing our concern because of our desire to maintain friendly relations with our Russian allies.[7]

There were not as many public reactions to President Truman's Potsdam speech as there would have been if the atomic bomb had not captured the headlines. And yet, since it was a Presidential message, it did not go unnoticed. In Tokyo, the newspapers referred mainly to the speech passages threatening further use of the atomic bomb if Japan did not surrender.[8] In Chicago, Polish-American groups were saddened by the apparent U.S. acceptance that Poland was not yet to be free.[9] Another newspaper reported a dispatch from Chungking stating that American circles in Asia paid particular attention to the President's statement that the United States would claim permanent overseas military bases, and it was noted that the President did not bind himself to Pacific bases only or otherwise inhibit American political aims.[10] Mr. Truman wrote a memorandum concerning his evaluation of the success of the talk: "Well, the speech seems to have made a hit according to all the papers. Shows you never can tell. I thought it was rotten."[11]

If the Potsdam speech is measured not in terms of reactions but in terms of how much it revealed of the real international tensions existing at that time, one would have to say that it was not a very accurate expression. There was tension—in fact—mounting tension over problems in Poland as well as in Rumania, but President Truman's Potsdam speech was consistent with a policy established by his predecessor—the policy of minimizing differences.

It cannot be said that President Truman was unaware of the mounting tensions, for in a private memorandum written two months earlier he had charged, "The Russians distribute lies about us."[12] Nevertheless, the Potsdam speech was typical of a period of friendly cooperation, and inasmuch as President Truman following Potsdam failed to point an accusing finger at early Soviet tactics of aggrandizement, the Kremlin appeared unimpeded in its drive for empire.

President Truman's Navy Day Address, October 27, 1945

About three months after the Potsdam report, the President was scheduled

[7] James F. Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly* (New York, 1947), p. 104.
[8] *Nippon Times* (English Language Edition), August 12, 1945, p. 1.
[9] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 11, 1945, p. 6.
[10] *Chicago Daily News*, August 10, 1945, p. 7.
[11] *Mr. President: First Publication from the Personal Diaries, Private Letters, Papers and Revealing Interviews of Harry S. Truman*, ed. William Hillman (New York, 1952), p. 125.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

to deliver what was billed in advance by White House secretaries as "the most important address on foreign affairs Mr. Truman had made since he came into office."

The occasion was Navy Day, October 27, 1945, and the place was New York City's Central Park. In addition to the address, the President participated in a motorcade, a formal luncheon, a two-hour review of navy ships, and the commissioning ceremonies of the new carrier, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During the actual address, Mr. Truman spoke from a high stand at the south end of the field where more than eighty thousand persons had found seats in row after row of wooden camp chairs. Out in the audience the latecomers stood in the aisles and on the fringes of the banks of seats.

In this first overall review of foreign policy since he had assumed office nearly seven months earlier, President Truman based his arguments on the principle that while the United States would strive to attain peace through the new United Nations Organization, it would support, nevertheless, "the world's greatest navy, land, and air forces for its own security."[13]

The heart of the foreign policy set out by Mr. Truman on this occasion was presented in twelve points, in one of which he stated:

> We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of any foreign power. . . . In some cases, it may be impossible to prevent forceful imposition of such a government, but the United States will not recognize any such government.[14]

The wide publicity given by the White House and executive staff to this address, both before and after its delivery, indicated that the speech was considered an important policy statement, for it was broadcast over all major radio networks. A special aspect of the speech is of interest to students of public address inasmuch as the occasion marked the first time in history a presidential address had been televised. The message was seen and heard by television viewers in New York City, Philadelphia, and Schenectady.[15]

The reception of the talk by the immediate audience was very favorable. The crowd applauded often and was particularly enthusiastic about the assertion that we would not recognize governments imposed by force.[16]

In the days following the speech American newspapers continued to report reactions most of which were quite favorable. Even the Chicago *Tribune*, generally regarded as an implacable foe of Mr. Truman and the Democratic administration, was somewhat mollified. The *Tribune* interpreted the speech as "a notice to Russian Dictator Stalin that his oppressions in Eastern Europe will not henceforth be condoned by the U.S."[17]

Some American newspapers, however, did interpret the speech as being too cautious and believed that since Russia was not mentioned specifically the implications would go unheeded. For instance, one Philadelphia paper found "little that was new and certainly nothing sensational," adding that while the government's diplomatic position was a delicate one, nevertheless, "the situation seemed to call for somewhat plainer speaking."[18]

That such mild criticism was not entirely unwarranted can be seen from the fact that even Moscow newspapers

[13] *New York Times*, October 28, 1945, p. 1.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[16] As reported by Will Lissner, *ibid.*, p. 32.
[17] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, October 29, 1945, p. 1.
[18] *Philadelphia Inquirer*, October 28, 1945, p. 6.

prominently displayed the twelve points announced by the American President and read into the speech evidence that international relations were entering a less strained period.[19] From Moscow one correspondent wired that the speech had come at a good time from the Soviet Union's viewpoint:

> Mr. Truman's reiteration of American principles for the post-war world was most encouraging here. Support for international collaboration has been at its lowest point since the collapse of the Council of Foreign Ministers.[20]

If one were to examine the Navy Day Address in terms of how much of the existing tension it revealed he might conclude that it came closer to revealing the actual tension of the time than any Administration speech yet given. It is also true that even though a coterie of diplomats may have been aware of the areas of friction between Russia and America in October 1945, and even though Russian-American diplomatic relations had been steadily deteriorating, the average American citizen was so elated over the war's end and so concerned with domestic problems that he had little idea as to either the causes or the degree of tension between the two great powers.

There was a recognizable change from the trend shown in the Potsdam speech, namely, that of minimizing the points in dispute. The Navy Day Address did bring America one step closer to open ideological warfare, but the talk offered only a gentle implication rather than an overt revelation of the existing tension. It seemed that it was not yet time for official American spokesmen to talk candidly about American-Soviet differences.

[19] *New York Times*, October 29, 1945, p. 1.
[20] As reported by Brooks Atkinson, *New York Times*, October 29, 1945, p. 1.

President Truman's Greek-Turkish Aid Message, March 12, 1947

A year and a half after the Navy Day speech, the reservoir of good feeling in America that had been built for the Russian nation was beginning to diminish. It was becoming impossible to overlook such factors as the Russian reparations policies, the Soviet liquidation of non-Communist leaders and parties, and a re-emphasis upon Marxist orthodoxy as announced by Soviet leaders.[21]

Of course, no examination of public addresses during this period should ignore a speech given by a foreigner in the very heartland of America. About six months after his Navy Day speech, President Truman had helped arrange Winston Churchill's visit to Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri. The exact amount of collaboration between President Truman and Mr. Churchill on the occasion of this "iron curtain" speech is somewhat speculative, but it is certain that the President had the assurance that the remarks of the world-famous Britisher would not be at variance with his own stiffening attitude regarding Russia. President Truman has admitted: "I knew what he was going to say; I didn't read his speech, but he talked to me on the train about what he was going to say."[22]

American citizens were genuinely alarmed by Churchill's pronouncements, and during the rest of 1946 international tension continued to mount. In Greece during the spring of 1947, there developed a serious and immediate crisis. That tiny country had suffered under the Nazis, but its ordeal was not yet over; on the contrary, in 1947 both political and economic troubles added

[21] See, for example, Byrnes, *op. cit.*, p. 255.
[22] Jonathan Daniels, *Man of Independence* (New York, 1950), p. 312.

to its internal turmoil. As indirect military interventions by the Soviets grew ever more effective, it became questionable whether Greece could even survive. Added to the problem was the decision of the British government to discontinue its economic and advisory assistance to Greece. This decision applied also to Turkey. The sudden change of British policy, when added to the economic and political conditions in Greece, forced the United States to make its decision; the Government decided to take no chances on either Greece or Turkey falling into Communist hands.

With these conditions as a backdrop, President Truman addressed the Congress on March 12, 1947. Not only did he ask for funds to carry out an aid program to Greece and Turkey, but he issued the bluntest policy statement yet made in the cold war. He warned that such aid would have to be given if Greece were to repel the armed minority led by Communists. Although he asked the Congress specifically to appropriate $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey, the implication in his message was much broader—the implication that we would give money and aid to any country making a legitimate fight against communism. The response to this Presidential address was immediate and widespread, for the message was quickly and correctly recognized at home and abroad as a departure from the policy of friendly cooperation at all costs.

In America, the proposals received favorable support even though it fell to Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg to explain Mr. Truman's apparent by-passing of the United Nations. The out-and-out opposition to the Truman Doctrine, as the policy was soon named, came from the liberals led by Henry Wallace and from isolationists. In Britain, France, and Italy there was considerable apprehension, but the feeling was that a necessary step had been taken.[23]

The Greek-Turkish Aid Message was significant for three reasons: (1) it brought the relations between Russia and the West to the most critical point in seven years; (2) it indicated a new determination within the Administration; and (3) the fact that it was quite favorably received meant there had been a change of attitude in the American public.

This speech was the first clue to the developing policy to be known as Containment. Although Mr. George Kennan is generally credited with being the chief architect of the Containment policy, President Harry S. Truman by virtue of his office must be recognized as its chief spokesman. The Truman Doctrine represented a military phase of Containment; later economic aspects were added by such programs as the Marshall Plan[24] and Point Four.

The doctrine of Containment was made public under the aegis of Mr. Truman, and when the need was acute or a problem was immediate, it fell to the Chief Executive to present the case to America and the world. As the chief spokesman for Containment, Mr. Truman seemed able to make his arguments clear and effective. For example, after the Greek-Turkish Aid Message, 82 per cent of the people interviewed in a nation-wide sample had heard or read about the speech. The poll takers asked, "Suppose other nations find themselves in the same fix as Greece: do you think

[23] John C. Campbell, *et al.*, *The United States in World Affairs, 1947-1948* (New York, 1948), pp. 39-41.

[24] The first announcement of this plan, named after Secretary of State George C. Marshall, was actually made by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson on May 8, 1947 at Cleveland, Mississippi. See, for example, the *Department of State Bulletin*, XVI, No. 411, May 18, 1947, pp. 991-94.

the U.S. will have to do something about it?" Sixty-eight per cent replied, "Yes."[25]

The policy of Containment ushered in by the Greek-Turkish Aid Message is still with us. It was the most significant change of policy in the last fifteen years, and it began a policy that has been followed since. The policy as announced and formulated by President Truman now has risen above party differences; it was a policy that brought the Marshall Plan into being, built up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, foiled the Berlin blockade, and finally met the Korean invasion with instant action. It was a policy announced by a spokesman who had to lead his listeners from an attitude of cooperation at all costs to one of Containment at any cost. This was a real and serious challenge for any persuader and particularly for America's Number One Voice.

The threat of world-wide communism is ever present. The Soviets continue to menace Berlin, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is still the military bulwark of the West. At any time the pressures may shift from Korea, to Formosa, to Laos, or to Cuba, but those pressures will continue to be unrelenting. The policy of Containment, which foretold continuance of U.S. resistance to communism, was made public by a speaker whose plain and forthright utterances more than compensated for what his addresses may have lacked in other rhetorical aspects. When evaluated as a spokesman for the policy of Containment, President Harry S. Truman will probably be regarded very favorably by historians.

[25] *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XI (Summer 1947), 286.

PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICES OF THE FOURTH PARTY

R. E. Davis

DURING the years 1880-1885, four men banded together in the House of Commons in order to stimulate their own party, the Conservatives, and to embarrass the Liberal government. Besides the two major parties in that parliament, there were the Irish who looked upon themselves as a separate party. The little group of free-lances with whom this essay is concerned adopted the pseudo-serious title of "The Fourth Party."[1]

Having its inception in the Bradlaugh disputes,[2] and standing out against a background of otherwise comparatively feeble opposition, the Fourth Party fairly leaped into prominence during the early sessions of Gladstone's second ministry. Performing more or less as a unit from the latter half of 1880 until the defeat of the Government in 1885, were Lord Randolph Churchill, John Eldon Gorst, Henry Drummond Wolff, and Arthur James Balfour. No member of this group had achieved remarkable recognition in 1880. Nor did they represent any large or powerful faction. Yet they rose from a position of relative obscurity to one of power and prestige in less than five years' time. This rapid rise was accomplished primarily by means of their activities in the House of Commons during that period. The parliamentary practices which they employed so successfully would therefore seem to be rhetorically significant.

Mr. Davis is Assistant Professor of Speech, Arizona State University. This paper was condensed from his doctoral dissertation, "The Characteristic Parliamentary Practices of the Fourth Party" (University of Illinois, 1959.)

[1] The Fourth Party is popularly supposed to have acquired its name when, in the course of debate, a speaker stated that there were two great parties in the House. "Three!" cried an Irish member. "Four!" exclaimed Lord Randolph Churchill. These remarks actually appear in *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, Series 3, CCLXII (1881), 1503.

[2] See below.

The Setting

In order to understand the practices adopted by the Fourth Party, it is necessary to know something of the parliamentary situation in 1880, of the issues which confronted that parliament, and of the attributes and convictions of the four men who comprised that little party.

In 1880 the Conservative Party under Disraeli suffered a stunning defeat at the polls, a defeat which resulted in a Liberal government which commanded a majority outnumbering the Conservatives and the Irish combined by more than fifty votes. Moreover, the Conservatives were in disrepute throughout the country. They were tagged as "the stupid party" and as "the do-nothing party." They were the party of the aristocracy at a time when the prevailing sentiment was democratic and liberal. The powerful organization which Disraeli had led to victory in previous years was now defeated and outmoded. "Haunted by profound distrust of an ever-growing democracy," and "conscious that the march of ideas was leaving them behind," the Conservative leader-

ship "could discern in the future no sign of returning fortune."[3]

Disraeli retired to the House of Lords as Lord Beaconsfield, with not long to live, and the party leadership rested jointly in the hands of Sir Stafford Northcote and Lord Salisbury. Sir Stafford was the leader of the opposition in Commons, and Lord Salisbury served a similar function in Lords. Not only was their joint leadership a somewhat cumbersome arrangement, but many felt that Sir Stafford lacked the virile qualities demanded of a leader of the opposition. Henry W. Lucy, parliamentary historian, described him as one "whose great notion of leadership is to follow, submissively prepared for death."[4] According to Arthur Balfour, "Sir Stafford Northcote [was] a scholar and a gentleman . . . but when it came to a fight, no more a match for Mr. Gladstone than a wooden three-decker would be for a Dreadnaught."[5] Certainly he was no bold warrior such as Disraeli had been, and this circumstance helped to provide the opportunity for the emergence of the rebellious young Fourth Party.

In contrast to the Conservatives, the Liberals presented an appearance of vigor and strength. Among their membership they numbered such eminent personages as John Bright, Joseph Chamberlain, W. H. Forster, Lord Hartington, and Sir William Harcourt. And they were led by the brilliant and versatile William Gladstone, in his second ministry, "the finest Parliamentarian of this or any other age."[6] Probably no party ever succeeded to power," reported the *Fortnightly Review*, "amid brighter or more hopeful circumstances than those which surrounded Mr. Gladstone's Government in April, 1880."[7] Formidable as this political structure seemed, however, it contained serious flaws which were eventually to contribute to its downfall. For, as John Morley points out, the Gladstone cabinet was a coalition cabinet, consisting of powerful representatives of various factions. Chamberlain, for example, was the leader of a rapidly growing Radical wing, and Lord Hartington represented a powerful and obstinate Whig section. And these two conflicting interest groups were to be in almost constant clash. So great did the dissension become that Gladstone once wryly remarked that it had been a good day; only three ministers had submitted their resignations.[8] As Speaker Brand remarked upon surveying the occupants of the treasury bench, Mr. Gladstone had "a difficult team to drive."[9]

According to Henry Lucy, Gladstone himself was somewhat the unwitting ally of the Fourth Party:

> When Lord Randolph Churchill spoke at him he listened with almost pained intentness, frequently interrupted with retort or corrections. Almost inevitably, when the brilliant and audacious free-lance had resumed his seat, the Premier rose to reply. With a man of Lord Randolph's sterling capacity and born Parliamentary aptitude, this is all that was needed to give him a position in the House of Commons.[10]

Finally, there were the Irish Nationalists or "home rulers." Ultimately, they hoped to accomplish home rule for Ireland, but the immediate objective of Parnell, their leader, was to maneuver the House into such a position that the

[3] Winston Churchill, *Lord Randolph Churchill* (London, 1906), I, 121.

[4] Henry W. Lucy, *Diary of Two Parliaments* (London, 1886), II, 164.

[5] Arthur J. Balfour, *Retrospect: An Unfinished Autobiography* (London, 1930), p. 144.

[6] Churchill, I, 119.

[7] George W. E. Russell, "The Coming Session," *Fortnightly Review*, XXXIX (January 1883), 1.

[8] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (London, 1903), III, 185.

[9] Cited by Morley, III, 2.

[10] Henry W. Lucy, *The Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone* (London, 1898), pp. 109-110.

Irish block might control the balance of power. Thus, in 1880, the Parnellites were quite willing to ally themselves with any faction which evinced a disposition to embarrass the existing government.

Not only did the political alignment present an opportunity for the Fourth Party, but also the issues which confronted that parliament were such as to encourage nonpartisan cleavages. For example, there was the Bradlaugh controversy. The issue was whether or not Charles Bradlaugh, a Liberal member who was an avowed atheist, should be permitted to take his seat in the House. Many Liberals were reluctant to support Bradlaugh's claim because of his unpopular religious views.

Then there was the "Irish question." Irish discontent, fostered by organizations of rebellion such as the Fenian Society[11] and the Irish Land League,[12] was heightened still more by the great famine of 1879.[13] In the elections the Irish had contributed to the Liberal victory and had some hope that their problems would be considered by the new ministry. When the Queen's Speech opened the new session, however, there was little mention of Irish affairs, and the Parnellites settled back, sullen and antagonistic.

The Gladstone ministry had their troubles in foreign affairs. In South Africa the Boers had long sought independence. Gladstone had expressed his sympathy, but, in office, he delayed until the Boers took up arms, then granted them their independence only after they had inflicted embarrassing defeats upon British forces.[14] The Government was thus left open to charges of cowardliness and ineptitude. Trouble also arose in Egypt, and it was not ended until after the British hero, General "Chinese" Gordon, was killed in the Soudan. On this issue the Government escaped a vote of censure by the narrowest of margins. Moreover, the ministry had difficulty in Afghanistan, where their uncertain policy tended to encourage Russian encroachment.

The Gladstone administration also encountered bitter opposition to their domestic policy. The Employers' Liability Act, a measure designed to increase the liability of employers for injuries sustained by employees on the job, tended to alienate wealthy Liberals. Obstructionist tactics practiced by the Irish and the Fourth Party led to hotly contested parliamentary reform legislation. The redistribution of constituencies and voting reforms, bills with which the Liberals had thought to enhance their popularity, resulted only in contributing to their ultimate defeat. And many other lesser Liberal proposals either met defeat in a divided House or died in the interminable debates and parliamentary maneuverings.

The four members of the Fourth Party combined certain personal attributes which enhanced their effectiveness as an instrument of opposition. Lord Randolph Churchill was of aristocratic

[11] The Fenian Society was a more or less secret society which claimed Irish independence as its goal and revolution as its method. The Fenians were most active in the 1860's when they triggered a full-scale revolution, but they were still in existence in 1880. See Justin H. McCarthy, *A History of Our Own Times* (New York, 1900), III, 60.

[12] The Irish Land League was formed primarily for the purpose of securing the passage of legislation to benefit the Irish tenant farmer. By 1880, the Fenians and the League had tended to unite under the leadership of Parnell.

[13] During the winter months of 1879-1880 there was a general failure of the crops. This meant inability to pay the rents to the English landlords, and that meant evictions and misery for the Irish tenant farmers.

[14] The British were defeated by the Boers at Bronkhorst Spruit, Laing's Nek, Ingogo River, and Majuba Hill, 1880-1881.

birth,[15] a circumstance which almost automatically guaranteed him a respectful audience often denied members with less fortunate connections. He was, moreover, an audacious, reckless, charming individual and a witty and resourceful—if not always prudent—debater. John Gorst brought to the Fourth Party vast experience, an encyclopedic knowledge of public affairs, and a shrewd legal mind. In conjunction with those of Lord Randolph Churchill, his talents were doubly effective. Indeed, Henry James once complained that the two of them were a "poacher's combination." Gorst was the pointer who found game for Lord Randolph to run down.[16] Sir Henry Wolff was cool and clever, a crafty debater, and the diplomat of the tiny party. Arthur Balfour, who cooperated with the group but who seems always to have regarded the association with skepticism, was a skillful and sharp-tongued debater. The four of them comprised an effective unit:

> The combination was irresistible: recklessness allied with caution, brilliant wit backed by encyclopedic knowledge, fertility of invention restrained by sober judgment, passionate enthusiasm blended with frigid logic—the statesman, the lawyer, the diplomatist, the philosopher, the democrat, welded together in a political Frankenstein monster. . . .[17]

Although the Fourth Party was primarily an instrument of opposition, its chief members professed a particular political creed, which they summed up in the phrase "Tory Democracy." Tory Democracy was a curious blend of Conservative and Liberal ideologies. The Tory Democrats clung to many Conservative ideas, such as economy of government and the established institutions of Church and State, but they also advocated many liberal measures. Possibly taking their cue from Disraeli, who, for a time, seems to have offered them some counsel, they were typically more Democrats than Tories. According to Professor Wilkinson, they "formed the left wing of their party and as advocates of a better political or social order . . . assumed an advanced position . . . in their efforts to 'elevate the condition of the people.' "[18] This creed permitted the Fourth Party to respond to Liberal legislation purely as conscientious politicians who identified their interests with those of the people. Instead of opposing liberal measures, as the Government doubtless expected a Conservative opposition to do, the Fourth Party frequently chided the ministry for failing to bring in truly democratic proposals. In effect they said to the Liberals: "The solution which you propose may be temporarily expedient; but there is a better solution—a more liberal one—which you ought to adopt." Thus, confronted by a Conservative opposition which actually professed to be more liberal than they, the Government were embarrassed and the Fourth Party were in an excellent position to carry on their tactics of harassment.

Strategical Methods

The ultimate goal of the Fourth Party was the downfall of the Liberal government, and they sought to achieve this end in two ways. First, they determined to strengthen, or, if necessary, to replace the regular Conservative leadership. Secondly, they endeavored to create frictions among the various factions of the government coalition.

[15] As the third son of a peer, John Churchill, seventh duke of Marlborough, he was called "Lord" Randolph, though he himself was never a member of the peerage.

[16] Cited by Janet Henderson Robb, *The Primrose League (1883-1906)* (New York, 1942), p. 29.

[17] Harold E. Gorst, *The Fourth Party* (London, 1906), p. 8.

[18] William J. Wilkinson, *Tory Democracy* (New York, 1925), p. 18. The phrase in single quotation marks is cited by Wilkinson from the works of John Gorst.

Early in the session of 1880 the Fourth Party undertook to supply some "backbone" to the opposition. It was with this in mind that they seized upon the Bradlaugh issue. Most of the Tory Party, including Northcote, eventually followed their lead. At the outset the four colleagues entered the fray "to assist Sir Stafford Northcote" and "not with the intention of usurping his authority. This was shown clearly enough by the fact that at first they always informed him of any steps they proposed to take, even if they did not actually seek his advice."[19] Very shortly, however, they began to hold their own private councils, to devise their own stratagems, and to act more and more as an independent entity. Sir Stafford noted in his diary that he had "had some difficulty in restraining Randolph Churchill from putting down an amendment of his own."[20] Later he wrote that Lord Randolph "came and told me that they had decided that if the division were taken on Pell's amendment, they would vote with the Government."[21]

The independent and often impudent attitude of these youthful insurgents was resented by many of the party faithful. There is evidence, however, that the antagonism which developed between the Conservative ex-ministers and the Fourth Party was not merely the consequence of the independent attitude of the four young men below the gangway.[22] Having learned on one occasion of the strategy of the Fourth Party, the Conservative leadership were known to "steal their thunder" by taking that action themselves.[23] At another time when the Fourth Party had succeeded in stirring up an angry debate, Sir Stafford proceeded to "throw oil on the troubled waters."[24] Such incidents were quite exasperating to the Fourth Party who "viewed the line of ex-Ministers on the Front Bench with those feelings of impatience which are natural to able men who see, or think they see, great opportunities of warfare cast away by persons much less able."[25] And they did not always attempt to conceal their irritation. Lucy records that once after having suffered a particularly blistering denunciation by Gladstone, Sir Stafford in reply was so "conspicuously feeble by comparison" that "the young lions below the gangway were in a state of speechless disgust," and they "showed their contempt for Sir Stafford Northcote by ostentatiously leaving the House."[26]

Although Northcote continued to oppose the Fourth Party when he considered their activities ill-advised, an examination of *Hansard* reveals a gradual diminishing of such opposition, and the nominal leader of the Conservatives spoke more and more frequently in support of some action initiated by the four free-lances. So evident was the capitulation of the regular opposition that by 1883 T. P. O'Connor asserted, "After a feeble resistance by the leaders in favour of the good old humdrum and respectable style of the Opposition, Sir Stafford Northcote and his friends have yielded before the stronger will and persistent industry of Lord Randolph Churchill and the Fourth Party."[27]

There were the "Elijah's Mantle" letters. Written upon the occasion of the unveiling of the statue of Lord Beaconsfield, they were a public expression of

[19] Gorst, pp. 74-75.
[20] Andrew Lang, *Life, Letters, and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote, First Earl of Iddesleigh* (London, 1890), II, 173.
[21] *Ibid.*, 175.
[22] Dividing aisle between the upper and lower portions of the House.
[23] Gorst, p. 68.
[24] Gorst, p. 114. See also *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLIV (1880), 330-332.
[25] Churchill, I, 148.
[26] Lucy, *Diary of Two Parliaments*, II, 66-67.
[27] T. P. O'Connor, *Gladstone's House of Commons* (London, 1885), p. 312.

Lord Randolph's views regarding the shortcomings of the Conservative leadership, a call for Lord Salisbury to come to the rescue, and a broad hint that if Lord Salisbury were not inclined to come forward, he himself was not unwilling to don the mantle of leadership.[28] Although the first letter caused a storm of protest, Lord Randolph, apparently undisturbed by the clamor, published a second letter in the *Times* in which he was even more critical. He said in part:

> Such a series of neglected opportunities, pusillanimity, combativeness at wrong moments, vacillation, dread of responsibility, repression and discouragement of hard-working followers, collusions with the Government, hankerings after coalitions, jealousies, commonplaces, want of perception on the part of the former lieutenants of Lord Beaconsfield, no one but he who has watched carefully and intelligently the course of affairs in Parliament can adequately realize or sufficiently express. . . .[29]

Although the regular Conservative membership of the House and a large portion of the press attacked Lord Randolph violently, ridiculing what they professed to consider his preposterous ambitions, the hue and cry subsided quickly enough when it became evident that public opinion was more for than against him. "By the end of 1883," notes Blanche Dugdale, "Lord Randolph had begun to base his power on his popularity in the country, a far surer foundation, as he well knew, than a reputation in the House of Commons."[30] As his popularity in the country grew, Lord Randolph and the Fourth Party became ever more independent, and their attacks upon both front benches became ever more biting and audacious. Moreover, in spite of their cries of protest, the main body of the Conservatives in the House followed the lead of the little party led by Lord Randolph Churchill. "They may not like the prescription he makes up for them," remarked Joseph Chamberlain, "but they always swallow it."[31]

Substantially supported by a considerable number of the Conservative Party in the country and somewhat reluctantly followed by a majority of the Tories in the House of Commons, the Fourth Party regularly assumed the leadership of the opposition during the years 1884-1885. So apparent had their supremacy become, that when Sir Stafford was asked what place he would give to Lord Randolph when the Tories came in, he is alleged to have replied ruefully, "Say rather what place will he give me?"[32]

The Fourth Party's stratagem of divide and conquer was first successfully carried out in the Bradlaugh disputes. Recognizing that Bradlaugh was sufficiently unpopular that many of the more cautious Liberals might be persuaded to vote against him if the issue could be made to appear to be something more than a party question, the Fourth Party declared from the first that it was a nonpartisan issue. According to Gorst the real question was "whether the House would sanction the Oath of Allegiance [sic] being profaned."[33] When the Government tried to sidestep the issue by referring it to a committee, the Fourth Party charged that this was merely an attempt to force the atheist on the House against the will of the majority. "In the comparative secrecy of the rooms upstairs," Gorst said, "the Government might venture to let in the hon. member for Northampton, when they dared not support a Resolution to let him in before the whole House."[34] The issue effectively split the

[28] *Times* (London), March 29, 1883, p. 9.
[29] *Times* (London), April 2, 1883, p. 8.
[30] Blanche Dugdale, *Arthur James Balfour* (New York, 1937), I, 50.
[31] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXXVI (1884), 851.
[32] Cited by Churchill, I, 377.
[33] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLII (1880), 392.
[34] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLII (1880), 394.

Liberal forces, and the Government suffered one humiliating defeat after another on the issue. Moreover, they were not able to dispose of this embarrassing problem during the entire life of the parliament.

One may recognize in the Fourth Party's persistent clamor for more liberal legislation another attempt to insert a wedge in the ministerial array. The Radical members of the government coalition were encouraged to feel dissatisfaction with their leaders because their legislation stopped short of true liberalism; the Whigs were made uneasy lest the Government adopt even more radical measures. It was in precisely this kind of a predicament that the ministry found themselves when they introduced the Employers' Liability Act.[35] Winston Churchill comments:

> The Government was gravely disconcerted. They found themselves between two fires. Below the gangway the Radicals stirred uneasily at such unanswerable argument; and behind the Treasury Bench the wealthiest supporters of the party were grinding their teeth at such reckless proposals.[36]

Fully cognizant of the fact that Irish votes had contributed to the defeat of the Conservatives in 1880, the Fourth Party did all they could to widen the rift between the Government and the Irish. At the same time they strove to split the Liberal majority by frequent references to what they labelled collusions between the ministry and the more radical element among the Irish. As conditions worsened in Ireland, and the Parnellites became more and more obstreperous in the House, the Fourth Party repeatedly charged the Government with making concessions to the now unpopular Irish at the expense of their own party. In other words, the Fourth Party simply tried to substitute the Irish Nationalists for Mr. Bradlaugh.

The difficulties of the Government in foreign policy matters also furnished the Fourth Party with opportunities to divide the supporters of the ministry. Conscientious Radicals were indeed hard pressed when called upon to explain their apparent sanction of British intervention in the Soudan. With reference to parliamentary reform, the Fourth Party charged that the Government sought to "gag" the House, particularly the Radical wing. Government bills for redistribution and electoral reform were, according to the Fourth Party, like the Employers' Liability Act, not truly liberal measures at all. The little party were incessantly jealous of the rights of private members, whose allotted time, they contended, was usurped by the Government; and they challenged these independent members to defy the ministry and stand up for their rights. In short, the Fourth Party seem to have overlooked no opportunity to arouse opposition to the ministry in their persistent effort to divide and conquer.

Obstructionist Tactics

Having considered the strategic methods used by the Fourth Party, let us now examine some of their more specific tactics. Of these, obstruction was one of the most prevalent. One method of obstruction was to "extend debate"[37] and filibuster. The Fourth Party's activity with respect to the Employers' Liability Act may be cited again to illustrate their tactics. Gorst began, contending that the bill provided only that recourse granted to a stranger injured on some-

[35] See above.

[36] Churchill, I, 138.

[37] To extend debate is to disagree, purely for the sake of disagreement, upon every point possible. For a more complete discussion of extended debate, see G. W. Rutherford, "Some Aspects of Parliamentary Obstruction," *Sewanee Review*, XXII (April 1914), 168.

one's property, and a stranger who was trespassing had no legal remedy whatsoever; therefore, the measure actually guaranteed no protection at all.[38] Moreover, he wished to know what the Government meant by the word "stock." Lord Randolph submitted the case of an employee injured by a horse's going lame. Would the employer be liable? And he added that "the replies of the Government had hitherto been unsatisfactory with regard to the meaning of the word 'stock,' and he would venture to suggest that the progress of the Bill would be facilitated by answers being given to reasonable questions."[39] When they were informed that the employer would not be liable in the hypothetical case propounded by Lord Randolph, Balfour wished to know whether this would still apply if the horse's injury resulted from some act of carelessness on the part of the employer.[40] Lord Randolph next wished to know whether the word "stock" could refer to livestock.[41] Gorst remarked with bland suavity that he "wished to do service to the Government, which, perhaps, they did not appreciate," but he really must insist upon a clear definition of what they meant by "stock-in-trade," since they apparently did not agree among themselves, and "it was most desirable, in a Bill of this kind, that the Government should clearly and explicitly state what they meant by the words they wished to put in the Bill."[42] And so it went. Section by section, sentence by sentence, and word by word, the Fourth Party insisted upon "aiding" the Government and upon "improving" their bill.

One of the most fertile fields the Fourth Party discovered for drawing out debate was in Committee on Supply.[43] Here they professed to be most zealous in the performance of their duty to the country:

> In assisting Committee of the House to vote Supply the Fourth Party was, in fact, absolutely unselfish in the public service. Its members would cheerfully sit up until three in the morning sooner than neglect to initiate the most searching inquiry into each item of ministerial expenditure. Every sixpence was subjected to scrutiny. The Minister in charge of the vote was kept busy half through the night replying to conundrums propounded by them. . . . Then, after several hours employed in this earnest criticism, a motion to report progress[44] would be proposed, on the ground that exhausted legislators could not be expected to serve the public interest in an efficient manner.[45]

A second method of obstructing consisted of asking innumerable questions; the Fourth Party had insatiable curiosity. Typically, their questions "hinted at disaster" and could be "triumphantly recalled" or "conveniently dropped" depending upon the outcome of the particular issue.[46] Moreover, having hit upon an issue which irritated and embarrassed the ministers, the Fourth Party were not to be put off until the question had been thoroughly aired. On June 10, 1880, for example, Gorst asked Sir William Harcourt whether he was aware of a certain pamphlet which purported to explain to Liberal candidates how they might bypass the laws pertaining to parliamentary elections. Sir William replied shortly that he was not aware of any such circular, whereupon Gorst politely gave notice that he would repeat the

[38] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLV (1880), 132.
[39] *Ibid.*, 139.
[40] *Ibid.*, 139-140.
[41] *Ibid.*, 147.
[42] *Ibid.*, 151-152.

[43] At the beginning of each new session of Parliament, the House of Commons resolved itself into a "Committee of the whole House" wherein Government estimates of expenditures for the coming session were presented, debated, and agreed upon by the members.
[44] A motion having the same effect as a motion to adjourn.
[45] Gorst, pp. 120-121.
[46] O'Connor, p. 73.

question at a later date.[47] Accordingly, he again posed the question on June 15. Receiving no answer and noting signs of ministerial embarrassment, he announced that he would ask the Prime Minister whether the names of certain prominent members of the Government did not appear upon the committee responsible for the offending circular.[48] Such interrogations could be, and frequently were, pressed to their ultimate conclusion, a lengthy and completely unrewarding debate insofar as the Government were concerned.

The Fourth Party often posed questions which consisted of several facets and required a considerable speech in order to supply an adequate answer. These many-sided questions had the added facility, if the interrogated minister attempted a full response, of providing a number of answers each of which could then be challenged. Moreover, the Fourth Party were fond of asking virtually the same question in a variety of ways of different ministers. This not only consumed parliamentary time without the necessity of inventing a new issue, but it also increased the possibility for a minister to make statements which might appear to conflict with those of his colleagues.

Another favorite technique which involved the use of the question was what the Fourth Party referred to as "drawing" Mr. Gladstone:

> Lord Randolph would lead off, drawing . . . Mr. Gladstone into lengthy reply. When the Premier resumed his seat, Drummond Wolff rose, and with profuse declarations of deference, asked for information on another point. Up got the Premier, brimming with energy and another speech. In this the subtle mind of John Gorst discovered a flaw. . . . On this he laboured for a quarter of an hour or more, Mr. Gladstone intently listening, whilst his colleagues on the Treasury Bench, conscious of the snare, tossed about in despair. The temptation to instruct these guileless young men, evidently searchers after truth, certainly most deferential in their recognition of age and experience, was too much for the Premier, who eagerly sprang to his feet with a third speech.[49]

The Fourth Party also made adept use of the amendment and of the various motions of adjournment[50] to obstruct the course of business. With the exception of the Irish, the Fourth Party moved more amendments, proposed adjournments more frequently, and raised more points of order than any other comparable group in the Twenty-second Parliament. Indeed, they may have utilized these tactics even more successfully than the Irish, for the Parnellites were openly hostile and rebellious. This earned for them the displeasure of the House, and they were not infrequently "named" and suspended from the chamber.[51] The Fourth Party, however, were invariably cool, courteous, and apparently innocent of any evil design.

The Fourth Party were also skillful at introducing amendments which precipitated debate; Lord Randolph once succeeded in launching a full-scale debate by moving an amendment to

[47] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLII (1880), 1615-1616.
[48] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLIII (1880), 70-72.

[49] Henry W. Lucy, *Sixty Years in the Wilderness: More Passages by the Way* (New York, 1912), pp. 350-351.

[50] Motions to "adjourn the debate," to "report progress," and that "the Chairman do now leave the Chair" were the most common forms. All were debatable and permitted the mover to discuss matters quite unrelated to the business at hand. After the passage of the parliamentary reform laws, however, such debate was severely restricted.

[51] When a member committed what was considered a "gross breach" of parliamentary etiquette, he was "named" by the Chair—that is, the Speaker would address him by name rather than as "The hon. member from ....."—and the offending member would then be suspended for a stipulated period of time. See Sir Thomas Erskine May, *A Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*, 11th ed. (London, 1906), p. 340.

change one word in a clause of a bill.[52] Moreover, the Fourth Party were adroit at proposing seemingly innocent amendments which were actually calculated to frustrate completely the aim of the legislation. Gorst is said to have been especially proficient in the practice of this tactic:

> When he is making some motion that must be peculiarly objectionable to the Prime Minister he begins with a profession of the deepest devotion to Mr. Gladstone personally, and even general agreement with his principles. His only object, Mr. Gorst professes with the most innocent air, is to carry out what he believes to be the real intention of the right honourable gentleman, and then he proceeds calmly to propose something which, if adopted, would utterly defeat everything Mr. Gladstone had in view.[53]

The Fourth Party monopolized much more than their allotted time as unofficial members of the Conservative minority. Churchill, who had addressed the House perhaps a dozen times in six years, now spoke more frequently than the leader of the opposition. He also asked more questions than did Sir Stafford. Wolff, the Fourth Party's most prolific questioner, outdid even Parnell, the leader of the Irish obstructionists. Commenting on the loquacity of the Fourth Party and the Irish, Lord Hartington estimated: "If the remaining 642 Members thought it necessary to speak as often and at the same length . . . it would take 215 weeks, or something over four years, to get through the ordinary Business of a Session."[54] As A. L. Rowse put it, "They were never more than four, but they made as much noise as forty and took up as much time as a hundred and forty."[55]

[52] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXII (1881), 394-398.
[53] O'Connor, p. 264.
[54] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLV (1880), 1789-1790. An ordinary session of Parliament lasted from seven to eight months.
[55] A. L. Rowse, *The Churchills* (New York, 1958), p. 221.

Invective and Abuse

According to Lord Randolph and his colleagues, the Gladstone ministry was a collection of scoundrels, and anyone who trusted or supported them must either be deluded or quite without principles himself. Since the rules of the House forebade open name-calling,[56] however, the Fourth Party were compelled to put much of their invective in the form of insinuations. When the Bradlaugh question arose, they made every effort to suggest that the ministry shared Bradlaugh's views. Morley wrote:

> The opposition turned affairs to ignoble party account, and were not ashamed in their prints and elsewhere to level the charge of "open patronage of unbelief and Malthusianism, Bradlaugh and Blasphemy," against a government that contained Gladstone, Bright, and Selborne, three of the most conspicuously devout men to be found in all England. . . .[57]

Early in 1880, Wolff asserted that the Prime Minister had "taken Mr. Bradlaugh entirely under his protection."[58] Gorst claimed that Bradlaugh was "the guide of the Government" and their "familiar friend."[59] Lord Randolph hinted that the attempt to seat the atheistic member in the House was a conspiracy hatched by Mr. Gladstone and John Bright.[60] The insinuation of guilt by association was climaxed in a speech delivered by Lord Randolph in 1884 when the desperate situation of General Gordon in Egypt became known to the House:

> As I listened to the Prime Minister last night [Lord Randolph confided to the House], a curious idea came into my head. I thought of

[56] "Any epithet which reflects upon the character of a member of either House, or upon the conduct of the King or of others in high places, is considered to be disorderly. . . ." See Harry Graham, *The Mother of Parliaments* (London, 1910), p. 163.
[57] Morley, III, 13.
[58] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLIII (1880), 612.
[59] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLX (1881), 485.
[60] *Ibid.*, 1556-1557.

the singularly different—the inexplicably different—manner in which different individuals appeal to his sympathies. I compared his efforts in the cause of General Gordon with his efforts in the cause of Mr. Bradlaugh. I remember the courage, the perseverance, the tenacity he displayed, and the amount of time of the House of Commons which was consumed by the Government in their desperate adherence to that man. If the hundredth part of those invaluable moral qualities bestowed upon the cause of a seditious blasphemer —(Cries of "Oh, oh!" and "Order!")—had been given to the support of the Christian hero, the success of General Gordon's mission would have been at this time assured. . . .[61]

The notorious Kilmainham Treaty[62] brought the Fourth Party many opportunities to imply that the government had consummated some nefarious bargain with the Irish. An Irish aid bill was the "price paid by the Government for the Treaty of Kilmainham."[63] The Premier, according to Lord Randolph, had conducted his explanation of that curious transaction with "extraordinary self-possession." "Some people," he added suggestively, "might call it something else."[64] As further evidence of some devious intrigue, Lord Randolph called attention to what he described as "the extremely nervous conduct" of the whole Liberal Party with respect to that transaction.[65]

During the debate on the Corrupt Electoral Practices Bill, the Fourth Party extended their abusive insinuations to the front opposition benches. It seemed possible, they intimated, that certain members of the Tory leadership did not have an altogether guiltless conscience with respect to their activities at the polls. Lord Randolph said:

It was a great misfortune that the Front Opposition Bench was upon this occasion so tenantless. He did not know whether the election transactions connected with 1880 were matters about which they felt a little delicacy. Certainly, it was a most remarkable feature that when a question of great importance to the House of Commons was being discussed they should have taken themselves off. . . .[66]

A second category of invective and abuse employed by the Fourth Party was the use of epithets. Both policies and persons suffered the most scathing appellations the Fourth Party felt the Speaker would allow. The motion to permit Mr. Bradlaugh to assume his seat in the House was "a concession to violence and mob-law."[67] Irish relief measures, such as the Compensation for Disturbances Bill, were "the first step in a social war" and "an attempt to raise the masses against the propertied classes."[68] This measure was a "ten-minutes Bill," "an afterthought," "an inspiration, but not from above."[69] The Government's "experiment" in Ireland had proved to be a "hideous failure," and this Government which had talked so glibly of ministerial responsibility had now shown itself to be utterly irresponsi-

[61] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXXVIII (1884), 200. See also Lord Randolph Churchill, *Speeches of the Right Honourable Lord Randolph Churchill*, ed. Louis J. Jennings (London, 1889), I, 146. In this source the words "seditious blasphemer" are omitted and "Mr. Bradlaugh" is substituted.

[62] The "Kilmainham Treaty" was not a formal treaty, and, at the most, seems to have been no more than a tacit understanding between the Government and the Parnellites. Having been arrested and imprisoned in Kilmainham jail, Parnell desired his freedom; and the Government, which had by then learned that the imprisonment of Parnell and certain other Irish leaders only seemed to aggravate the turmoil in Ireland, ardently desired peace. Consequently, a kind of gentlemen's agreement seems to have been struck. If freed, Parnell would do what he could to reduce the turmoil.

[63] This was the Arrears of Rent Bill. See *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXIX (1882), 1323.

[64] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXV (1882), 48.

[65] *Ibid.*

[66] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXXVII (1884), 1216.

[67] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLX (1881), 1556-1557.

[68] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLIII (1880), 1640. The phrase, "the first step in a social war," is omitted from the Jennings edition of Lord Randolph's *Speeches*, I, 2.

[69] *Ibid.*, 1649.

ble.[70] The Irish Land Bill was a scheme for "public plunder and robbery" and an "immense engine for State interference." It was "the most demoralizing and disastrous proposal, not only to Ireland, but to England, which could possibly be made by a responsible Minister of the Crown." It "contained within it all the elements of destruction to States. In it and by it, plunder, rapacity, dishonesty, agitation, mob-law, all received the final and solemn sanction of Parliament."[71] As for the Kilmainham Treaty, Arthur Balfour branded it a transaction so vile that it "stood alone in its infamy."[72]

For individuals in the Liberal camp, the Fourth Party had an epithet for every important minister. Sir William Harcourt was a "bombastic Furioso of debate,"[73] Sir Henry James was a "vulture,"[74] and Herbert Gladstone, the Prime Minister's son, had engaged in the "hairbrained chatter of irresponsible frivolity."[75] The Prime Minister's threats against the House of Lords upon their rejection of his Reform Bill were so much "Falstaffian braggadocio." Nothing, Lord Randolph added, was easier than "to detect the difference between the demagogue's bray and the people's roar."[76]

Perhaps the Fourth Party's most characteristic form of invective and abuse was sarcasm and irony. Many a thrust was made during the Bradlaugh incidents. For example, in reply to a speech by the Attorney General, Lord Randolph remarked that he "did deplore that the Attorney General . . . should get into such a panic, and with bated breath and artificial solemnity should have warned the House of the peril it was incurring . . . by resisting a man who defied the law."[77] Irish affairs were also a source of much ironic comment from the Fourth Party. Concluding one of his speeches on Irish problems, for example, Lord Randolph delivered the following sarcastic prognostication:

> Before long they would see the Chief Secretary [for Ireland] come down to the House and ask for Westneath Acts, Arms Acts, Curfew Acts, and other similar measures, which were always required for the Government of Ireland whenever the Liberal Party was in power. (Laughter)[78]

To the Fourth Party's great delight, this prediction was fully borne out by the events of the following year.

The Fourth Party were particularly fond of calling attention to apparent inconsistencies between the words and actions of ministers. When Parnell and his friends were released from Kilmainham, for example, Wolff slyly recalled the language of the Prime Minister at the time of their arrest. "Were they still 'steeped to the lips in treason'?" he inquired. "Were they still the 'promoters of outrage'?"[79] Nor did years of venerable service protect members of the Liberal majority from the Fourth Party's satirical shafts. Referring to an unfortunate remark by Bright, Gorst retorted:

> This was the way in which the right hon. Gentleman . . . invoked the passions of the class whom he formerly called in the House "the residium"—men not to be reached by argument and reason, but to be appealed to through their passions. . . .[80]

This Government, Gorst went on to say, "having got into Office by inflaming the

[70] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLIX (1881), 835-836. See also Churchill's *Speeches*, I, 24.
[71] *Speeches*, I, 33.
[72] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXIX (1882), 836.
[73] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXI (1881), 1684.
[74] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXXI (1883), 279.
[75] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXVI (1883), 492.
[76] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCXC (1884), 705-708.
[77] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXVIII (1883), 1440-1441.
[78] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLIII (1880), 1651. See also *Speeches*, I, 10.
[79] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXIX (1882), 139.
[80] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLII (1880), 1367.

minds of 'the residium,'" ought now to carry out some of their campaign promises.[81]

Above all, the Fourth Party loved to turn the Prime Minister's own sterling rhetoric against him. Gladstone had opened the new parliament of 1880, for example, with an exuberant speech in which he expressed the conviction of being under Divine Guidance.[82] That "Divine light" by which the Premier professed to be guided, Lord Randolph quipped, often "glimmered with a most feeble ray."[83] And again, he said: "When they came to the question of real justice —equal justice—it was perverted into sordid expectations from the Imperial Exchequer, and in that case 'the Divine light of justice' was measured by pounds, shillings, and pence, and so became anything but Divine. . . ."[84] Since Gladstone was often referred to as "The Grand Old Man," Lord Randolph once raised a great laugh in the House by alluding to his proposal for certain large standing committees to handle routine matters of legislation, as "The Grand Old Committees."[85]

These tactics are representative of the Fourth Party's employment of invective and abuse. In 1880, in its leading article, the *Saturday Review* noted these practices:

> Conservative alacrity takes the form of free invective, hard hitting, and general aggressiveness. . . . In Parliament, to draw Mr. Gladstone if possible, or, if not, to bait his colleagues, to denounce every Ministerial measure, and to retard the acceptance of every Ministerial proposal . . . these are the arts by which the more effervescent Conservatism now seeks to conquer. . . .[86]

The Fourth Party led the way in initiating tactics of this kind.

Conclusion

Given the peculiarly appropriate climate of the parliament of 1880, the Fourth Party originated and developed their characteristic strategy and tactics. We may now ask: how effective were these practices?

For the purposes of opposition, the Fourth Party's goal was the defeat of the Liberal government. This end was accomplished on June 8, 1885, with the resignation of the Gladstone government. The Fourth Party, however, cannot be considered mainly responsible for this final victory. The turmoil in Ireland, foreign policy problems, opposing forces within the cabinet, the bitter opposition of the Parnellites, all of these were other potent contributing factors. Nevertheless, it is perhaps fair to conclude that the Fourth Party did much to call attention to the Government's failures and to encourage division in their ranks. By chaffing the opposition, by encouraging rebellion in the Liberal coalition, by constantly hindering the progress of business, and by persistent condemnation of the ministers and their policies, the Fourth Party made a significant contribution to the downfall of the Liberal government, and, in the process, succeeded in making their own political fortunes.

[81] *Ibid.*, 1368.
[82] Morley, III, 1-2.
[83] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXII (1881), 2031.
[84] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXIII (1881), 1549.
[85] *Hansard*, Ser. 3, CCLXXV (1882), 172.
[86] "The Opposition," *Saturday Review*, L (November 1880), 639.

AUDIO-LINGUAL AIDS TO LANGUAGE TRAINING—USES AND LIMITATIONS

Herbert Schueler

ANYONE doubting the ascendancy of the machine as a preoccupation of teachers of language should compare a current issue of almost any one of our professional journals with one of but twenty years ago. Most striking are the advertisements; once predominantly devoted to restrained announcements of the latest textbooks, they are now largely dominated by lavishly illustrated copy extolling the newest in electronic machines and their associated furniture and supplies. The articles, too, reflect this change. It is a rare issue indeed that does not carry several articles on mechanical aids to teaching and learning. In fact, any discussion of method in education these days takes place largely within a machine context. If one were to remove from proceedings of professional conferences any discussion of television, language laboratories, and so-called teaching machines, there would be little left for recorders to summarize, and some of our learned journals would be hard put to fill their quota of pages in the coming year. The electronic age is upon us with a vengeance. Mark Hopkins' log is wired for sound, and Mark himself is now an infinitely reproduceable and sometimes mercifully erasable tape activated by push-buttons. The friendly, tweedy book salesman, so long a fixture in our academic offices and conventions, is being joined, and often overshadowed by the brisk, steely-eyed electronic systems sales engineer, exhuding sparks of expensive efficiency from every wired pore.

Mr. Schueler is Director of Teacher Education, Hunter College. *This essay is a revision of a paper presented to the Speech for Foreign and Bilingual Students Interest Group at the December SAA convention in St. Louis.*

And yet, with it all, there is controversy. Let us give thanks to our tradition of critical examination in all matters of education that there is controversy. To be sure, a still too large portion of this discussion is dominated by the irreconcilable extremes: the pro-hardware versus the anti-hardware camp; the science of teaching versus the art of teaching advocates; those who decry the stultifying restraints of tradition versus those who point to the danger of bleeding to death from exposure to the cutting edge of progress. No extreme position is fruitful; leaning too far backward or catapulting too far forward have the same basic result—falling down. Yet, in the case of audio-lingual aids to learning—the machine movement that began with the phonograph, continued through the disc recorder and the wire recorder, and culminated with the tape recorder and the language laboratory—we should by now have amassed sufficient experience to have mastered their proper applications in the processes of language teaching and learning, without being dominated by them either in uncritical advocacy or uncompromising opposition.

This discussion is an attempt, therefore, to assess the values and limitations of audio-lingual devices with some degree of objectivity within the practical context of the teaching-learning situation.

The audio-lingual recorder-reproducer that we know as the tape recorder has

reached, even in relatively low-priced versions, a strikingly accurate reproduction of the human voice, endowed with an impressive degree of that quality known as "presence." It is possible, therefore, to record human speech and song with such fidelity that another's voice is clearly recognizable on a machine that is extremely simple to operate, reliable and consistent in performance, and of reasonable cost. Those of us who, only yesterday it seems, struggled with cumbersome disc recorders with their short-lived cutting styli, tangling masses of inflammable acetate thread, and highly variable reproduction quality, can appreciate the ease of operation of even the meanest of present-day tape recorders.

In considering the use of the tape recorder as an aid to teaching and learning, however, we must analyze its capabilities a little further. As a reproducing and recording instrument, it is capable of reproducing and recording sound with a fidelity that encompasses the full range of sound frequency detectable by the human ear. It is, however, an exclusively aural instrument, and to the extent that sound has a visual dimension, it is restricted to an incomplete version of sound. In the case of speech, it is particularly and crucially limited in that it excludes gesture, facial expression, and indeed physical presence. It reproduces speech in disembodied form, with both pedagogical advantages and disadvantages—the advantage of concentration on the sound element alone, and the disadvantage of segmentation and incompleteness. (Sound film and television, by the way, extend the fidelity of reproduced speech to include the visual, but with the limitation that the visual element is two-dimensional and usually monochromatic, and when in color, is perceptively contrived.)

As an instrument of pre-recorded sound the tape recorder does everything that a good phonograph can do, but its greatest advantage over the phonograph lies in its ability to record sound material and play it back immediately. It is this function of the tape recorder that has given birth to the language laboratory and that provides the electronic buttress of the so-called audio-lingual method of language teaching. But precisely what does it record, and even more important, what does it play back to the one who has recorded his own speech? Stated simply, the machine plays back an individual's speech as others hear it, not as he hears himself. Stated technically, an individual hears himself as transmitted by an integrated combination of air conduction—externally from mouth to ear—and bone conduction, internally from voice mechanism to inner ear. He hears his recorded voice, however, as if it were produced by another person, through air conduction alone. He may be taught to recognize his own voice as played back by a tape recorder, but it will always sound significantly different from the voice he himself hears as he produces speech and communicates with others. Here again we note a condition that has both pedagogical advantages and disadvantages. The individual hears himself as others hear him, and therefore he can perceive critically his effect on others. On the other hand, he can achieve little kinship with his own recorded voice, and therefore may find it difficult to transfer lessons learned in listening to himself as recorded to the actual problems of face-to-face communication, a situation in which he again is prevented from hearing himself as others hear him.

Communication is a two-way process, in which the initiative passes alternately from the initiator to the receptor, and

in which stimulus not only breeds response, but the response itself acts as a stimulus for consequent response. In the recorder-learner situation, however, response is limited to whatever has been recorded, and in no case can the response itself act as a stimulus to the recorder. The recorder can only *re*produce, it cannot produce; it can repeat, but it cannot react; it can communicate *to* but not *with*, and what it does communicate is only what has been fed into it. It is lacking, therefore, in the essential social element of communication, which requires the interplay of a minimum of two volitional agents.[1]

With these characteristics in mind, we can consider the pedagogical uses of the tape recorder. What then, are the pedagogic functions it can perform well? Because it reproduces sound accurately, and because it can repeat itself as often as required, it lends itself spectacularly well to exercises in aural perception and lingual imitation. Because it has the ability to record and play back immediately the student's imitation of the model, it makes possible an objective comparison of model and imitative response by either an outside evaluator or the student himself.

It is therefore predominantly and pre-eminently a device for drill and objective evaluation. And as with all devices and procedures for drill and evaluation, it is subject to many problems of use within the total teaching-learning complex, some of which are common to all drill and evaluation, and some of which are unique to the particular medium itself.

We all know that the purpose of drill is to provide the means for repetitive exercise which will culminate in proper language and speech habits.

All repetitive exercise depends for its effectiveness (1) on its appropriateness for the skill to be learned, (2) on the motivation and determination of the learner, and (3) on the ability of the learner to transfer what is learned in drill to practical use. The imitation exercises and pattern practice characteristic of machine utilization in language learning are therefore but a portion of the whole teaching-learning-application complex, and by the same token, the most elaborate and flexible language laboratory cannot be expected to do the whole job of language teaching. The challenge is to build the machine into the whole process in such a way that it can be of maximum use. Proper attention must be given to the preparation of the student for the specific exercises he is to use, to the monitoring of his progress, and above all to the application of what he has learned to the realistic requirements of communication with others. In some of these requirements the sound recorder extends measurably the scope and flexibility of drill; it is possible to individualize exercise material according to the needs of each student, and to maintain a continuous check on his progress, either through monitoring as the student works or through subsequent analysis of his tapes. On the other hand, even with maximum motivation, the danger of fatigue must be reckoned with in any extension of exercise sessions beyond fifteen minutes. A point of diminishing returns can set in very quickly, beyond which actual deterioration of student response may occur. This applies particularly to restricted and specific speech drills, exercises for the correction of lalling, d—th substitutions, or bi-lateral emissions, for example. As with all drill, however,

[1] Henry Nelson Wieman, in his article, "Speech in the Existential Situation" (*QJS*, April), has a graphic description of the limitations and dangers of mechanized communication.

variation in format, changes of pace, and above all, variation in expected student response, can extend profitably the time a student spends with the tape recorder at a single sitting.

As to the problem of transfer to the actual communication situation, the recording is severely limited in scope. As we have seen, it can provide repetitive exercise within a controlled stimulus-response context, and can provide for the student an objective comparison of his own achievement with that of the models he imitates. Since he hears himself as others hear him, he can more readily detect the degree to which he falls short of the standard. On the other hand, since in communication he hears himself subjectively, and then only through the single dimension of sound, and since in communication he must act within an environment that is not controlled in any way as it was in the taped drill, transfer remains a problem as it does in any mode of formal language learning. No matter how flexible and sophisticated the audio-lingual devices may be, a major portion of formal language teaching must still be concerned with the setting of speech within the environments and conditions of practical communication. In sum, no matter how effective the work with the machine is, a major concern of the language teacher must still be the activities that come before and lead into the use of the recording device, and those activities that come after and may grow out of the listening and recording exercises.

Inevitably, the tape recorder is built into an architectural system of booths, and individually and centrally controlled tape decks, which we know as the language laboratory. We must recognize that as soon as major capital outlay and the permanent transformation of space is involved, the facilities themselves will tend to influence the nature of instruction. It is vital, therefore, that we recognize the functions that we expect to have performed, and recognize both values and limitations.

The functions of a formalized language laboratory are basically two: the library or self-instruction function, and the classroom or teacher-guided function. In the former, the student uses the laboratory as he would a library—he borrows asigned tapes, takes them to a booth, and works with them individually much as he would borrow books from the reference desk and work with them at study tables. In the latter, the laboratory is built into the instruction itself, with the teacher in control, guiding the use of the recorders, monitoring them when necessary through a central control panel and communication system, and communicating with individuals or groups of students as the need arises. The two functions are of course not mutually incompatible, but they are probably best achieved in separate facilities, with a language laboratory reserved for self-study and individual exercises, and a series of "electronic classrooms" used for guided language instruction. The self-instructive language laboratory, as long as it is looked upon as a supplement to instruction in the manner of a library workroom, is the least vulnerable to suppression of creativity in a system of language teaching, but the electronic classroom must be designed and used most carefully, lest its machinery act as a determinant of, rather than an aid to, language learning. It is therefore essential that the audio-lingual machinery to be used in the classroom be designed for utmost flexibility, so that all-class, small-group, and individual activities may be possible with a minimum of button pushing and dial twisting. And it should be

possible to communicate with students in groups and individually not only via microphone and programmed tape, but in the old-fashioned way of air-conducted voice. In recognition of the fact that communication is a social affair, it should be possible, in addition, for students and teachers to break out of the confinement of sound-treated booths and meet each other and the teacher face to face. An electronic classroom is best conceived, therefore, in a manner which will allow the walls of booths to be folded down over recording mechanism, microphone and tape, or even removed entirely, so that those aspects of language learning which are not reduceable to taped exercise can receive their proper attention.

As we consider the limitations of audio-lingual aids in their present stage of development, we must expect that suggestions will be forthcoming to overcome these limitations by further mechanical and electronic means. The sound recording system does not embody the visual elements of speech—facial expression, gesture, and other bodily movement? Very well, let us equip each language laboratory with a self-contained closed-circuit television system complete with vidicon camera and monitor, so that the student will not only be able to hear himself as others hear him, but see himself as others see him as he speaks. And in the ultimate development, we could provide for transmission of sound and associated image to a kinescope or video-tape recorder so that a record may be available for later evaluation. Does this sound far-fetched? In the institution I represent, we are doing something quite similar in an associated field—we are kinescoping student teachers as they teach, and our supervisors work with them as they hear and watch a recording of the student teacher having taught. We believe this method has great possibilities in assisting the development of skill in any of the performing arts—and teaching is obviously one of them. Yet we find ourselves in constant danger of allowing our fabulously expensive equipment to determine our educational goals and methods, rather than of having them act properly as means and aids to our goals. We are in constant danger of being more preoccupied with making use of our equipment than with furthering the development of our students. Tragically enough, the greater the usefulness of the machine, and certainly the greater its expense, the more are we in danger of being dominated by it. In consequence, we are determined to pay as much attention to discovering the limitations of our machines as we are in developing their use.

Thus it is with audio-lingual aids to language learning. They can do much to make our work as teachers of language more effective. They will not make the task easier, however, nor will they make it cheaper, nor will they do it all.

THE CLASSICAL CONCEPTION OF EPIDEICTIC

J. Richard Chase

THE Greek rhetorical term epideictic (*epideiktikon*) is generally interpreted in one of three ways: to some it is simply the oratory of praise and blame and goes under such banners as "panegyric," "eulogy," or "encomium"; others take epideictic as a wastebasket term that embraces all non-deliberative, non-forensic oratory and frequently refer to its spectrum of discourse as "Occasional Oratory"; many consider epideictic as synonymous with display (just what it is that is displayed, however, is still open to discussion) and present it under such epithets as "The Oratory of Display," "Demonstrative Oratory," or even "Ceremonial Oratory." Obviously with such a variety of definitions in circulation epideictic cannot help but be, on occasion, a source of confusion.

In the contemporary scholarship that has been expended on epideictic one is hard pressed to find a definition of the term that speaks for a majority of the ancient rhetoricians. In most instances scholars have been more concerned with what they found in so-called epideictic orations than what the ancient theorists and critics said about epideictic as a rhetorical concept.[1] Such practice is risky. Orators then, as now, did not feel compelled, in a given oration, to "stick to the subject," much less to a predetermined class of oratory with all of its special techniques and topics. Hence, if one really tries, he can find evidence in many panegyrics or funeral orations to support any definition of epideictic that strikes his fancy.

What was the dominant classical conception of epideictic? An answer to this query is attempted in this paper.

1.

John William Hay Atkins, who calls Gorgias of Leontini "the founder of artistic prose," considers his emphasis upon style (*elocutio*) instrumental in establishing epideictic as a separate class of oratory.[2] Though we may speculate on who, if any, were the predecessors of this rhetorical extrovert from Sicily, his followers are legion. Even in the fifth century before Christ, Gorgias was not the only foreigner with dazzling oratory who made his way to Athens. The influx, apparently, was so great that there soon was a separate class of orators. Richard Volkmann writes that oratory had now to be divided into two classes: *pragmatikon*, the practical oratory of the Athenian citizen who possessed the right to speak in the court or in the assembly of the people, and *epideiktikon*, the oratory of the non-citizen who was permitted to speak only at festivals or through either the written word or, as logographers, through the Athenian citizen.[3] As a basis for this dichotomy

Mr. Chase is Associate Professor of Speech at Biola College. Portions of this article are based on research conducted for his dissertation, "The Classical Conception of Epideictic" (Cornell University, 1961).

[1] See, e.g., D. A. G. Hinks, "Tria Genera Causarum," *Classical Quarterly*, XXX (1936), 170-176.

[2] "Gorgias" and "Rhetoric, Greek," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 391, 766.

[3] Richard Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 16.

Volkmann refers to Syrianus of the Second Sophistic, who, in commenting upon the history of rhetorical divisions, writes: "For those who systematize rhetoric into divisions, from genre into species, assert that rhetoric is the genus, and that it is composed of two species; functional oratory (*pragmatikon*) and the oratory of display *(epideiktikon)*."[4] *Epideiktikon,* the term selected to head this latter class, comes from *epideiknumi* (to show or display) and, hence, was the logical term to describe the rhetorical practices of Gorgias and his kind. The term as applied by Syrianus and later Volkmann does not at any time refer to such rhetorical functions as praising and blaming. The political status of the speaker with his chararteristic approach to oratory was the basic criterion.

Though the evidence is admittedly meager, our first encounter with epideictic is primarily etymological. It represented an oratory of display, the characteristic approach of the non-citizen. Though this particular concept of epideictic was short-lived, apparently it did persist until the advent of Aristotle's *Rhetoric.* Prior to the *Rhetoric* there was such a thing as praising and blaming but it was called just that, *egkomiastikon* and *psektikon.* Gorgias and Isocrates, for instance, composed encomia. And Isocrates, so Quintilian informs us, "held that praise and blame find a place in every kind of oratory";[5] such was the case in actual practice both in Isocrates' day and throughout the classical era, as a study of the discourse reveals. Even in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum,* a work that reflects pre-Aristotelian rhetoric, praise and blame are not directly associated with an epideictic class of oratory. Though it is true that all known texts of the *ad Alexandrum* begin by stating that public speeches are divided into three kinds (*dēmēgorikon*—civic or deliberative, *epideiktikon*—epideictic, and *dikanikon* —forensic), there is little reason for viewing the body of the work from a tripartite standpoint.

In the first place there is some evidence that the word *epideiktikon,* like the generally conceded fictitous letter of introduction, was added to the text by a later hand. Quintilian notes that a certain "Anaximenes regarded forensic and public oratory as *genera* but held that there were seven *species:* exhortation, dissuasion, praise, denunciation, accusation, defence, inquiry. . . ."[6] The similarity between this quotation and the first two sentences of the *ad Alexandrum* is striking—only the term *epideiktikon* is missing. Spengel, for one, feels so strongly that Quintilian is referring to the *ad Alexandrum* that he emends his edition[7] of the *ad Alexandrum* to bring it into conformity with Quintilian's comment. And Burgess, in his comprehensive survey of epideictic literature, supports the same thesis when he writes that "Anaximenes classed all oratory as belonging either to the assembly or the court."[8] In addition, the author of the apparently spurious introductory letter that prefaces the treatise indicates that orginally (or

[4] My translation of the Greek quotation as cited by Volkmann on p. 16. Though Volkmann breaks off the Greek text at this point, Syrianus, indicating the further development of classification, continues: "whereas others say three; forensic, deliberative, and panegyric; and there is also the fourth which some add, historiography." Christianus Walz, *Rhetores Graeci,* IV (Stuttgart and Tubingen, 1833), 60.

[5] *Institutio Oratoria* iii. 4. 11, trans. H. E. Butler (Cambridge, Mass., 1921). All references are to this edition.

[6] *Ibid.,* iii. 4. 9.

[7] *Rhetores Graeci,* I, ed. Leonardi Spengel (Leipzig, 1853).

[8] Theodore C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *University of Chicago Dissertations,* 1901-1902, XVII (Chicago, 1909), 95.

at least when he possessed the text) there were but two major genera under consideration for he concludes his letter with a reference to civic and forensic oratory and then adds: "So from the present memoranda, written specially for you, you will be well supplied with regard to each of them."[9]

Even if one rejects Spengel's emendation and the Anaximenean hypothesis of authorship there is still the testimony of such men as Havet,[10] Volkmann, and Cope,[11] who all maintain that the body of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* hinges not upon three kinds or even two kinds of oratory, but upon the seven functions or rhetorical operations that are listed in the second sentence of the treatise proper. On this point, the intrinsic evidence seems most convincing. Each section of the work is introduced, not with a general heading such as deliberative or epideictic, but by stating the functions to be discussed. For example, the first section of the *ad Alexandrum* begins with a discussion of exhortation and dissuasion—not "deliberative" oratory. Later we are introduced to encomium and blame, and the term epideictic is conspicuously absent. Though it is true that elsewhere the author writes that, as a rule, in praising "we are not speaking to contest a case but for display,"[12] he is there merely describing the general nature of praising and blaming and uses the adverb (*epideixeōs*) rather than the noun (*epideiktikon*). In short, epideictic, as a class of oratory, is absent from the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*.

Like the encomium, the panegyric also existed well before Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. The panegyric was generally delivered before national assemblies such as the Olympic festivals and was frequently dominated by praise. It was often referred to as epideictic oratory, but primarily because the panegyric was delivered either by a non-citizen or by an Athenian who relied on rhetorical display for impact, not necessarily because praise was included.

2.

It remained for Aristotle to associate formally praise and blame with epideictic. In the *Rhetoric* epideictic is used to identify Aristotle's third kind of oratory.[13] The term does double duty; it both designates and describes. Epideictic designates a class that is dominated by the praising and blaming of things noble and disgraceful. On the other hand the term is also descriptive; retaining its etymological sense, it connotes an oratory of display. Aristotle maintained that the audience sat *either* as judge *or* spectators. By this we must not assume, however, that Aristotle thought the content of epideictic was worthless. Earlier he has informed us that the art of rhetoric concerns only those matters upon which we deliberate. And he reminds us that we do not deliberate except upon matters which clearly admit two sides.[14] His thesis is simply that in deliberative and forensic discourse the audience is primarily concerned with the "debatable subject"; in epideictic their interest is centered upon the speaker's performance. Though

[9] 1421 b, trans. Harris Rackham (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).

[10] Ernest Havet, *Étude sur la Rhétorique d'Aristote* (Paris, 1846), p. 124.

[11] E. M. Cope, *Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric* (London, 1867), p. 419. Cope, while quite critical of Spengel's emendations and the Anaximenean hypothesis, states, at the conclusion of his treatment of the *ad Alexandrum's* section on praise and blame, "*not a word is said of these two being subordinate to any genus.* There is no *epideiktikon genos* there."

[12] 35. 1440 b. 12-14, trans. Harris Rackham.

[13] The following material is drawn primarily from i. 3. 9.

[14] i. 2. 12.

epideictic premises are open to debate —generally in reference to degree—[15] these premises are, nevertheless, of secondary importance. In short, in epideictic there is no burning issue that demands a decision. Thus the listener, not caught up in the conflict of ideas, can better appreciate the artistic efforts of the speaker.

But a question has been raised; just what is displayed? Some hold that the orator's virtuosity in style (*elocutio*) is the primary thing to be displayed;[16] others feel that content is displayed. Two Germans, Oskar Kraus and F. J. Schwaab, have done much to advance the latter view.[17] Kraus, in particular, asserts that Aristotle derived the term *epideiktikon* from the active *epideiknunai* rather than from the middle *epideiknusthai*. Consequently it is display of content, not display of self or one's rhetorical abilities. Such reasoning makes epideictic the setting forth or "logical demonstration" of noble ideas. Kraus, then, interprets Aristotle's *dunamis* as the power or force of the content rather than the speaker's rhetorical power.

One may argue, however, that it is the orator's virtuosity that is displayed, and counter that Kraus' reasoning destroys the significance of Aristotle's passage; displaying or demonstrating ideas (content) is necessary in each type of discourse if communication is to take place. A useful distinction is made by Aristotle only if *epideiktikon* is allowed to signify something quite apart from the general presentation of ideas to the mind of the audience.

The controversy may be properly minimized when one considers that rhetorical ability can be manifest in any or all facets of the art: invention, disposition, style, delivery, or memory. If one maintains that the content is to be displayed, it would appear that the one who selects, arranges, and amplifies the ideas has ample opportunity to display his rhetorical ability or power in these areas as much as in the selection and arrangement of the words themselves. Certainly "invention is the man" as much, if not more, than style. As will be remembered, Gorgias' oration on Helen of Troy was prepared to display his "inventive" genuis on a difficult subject as well as his ability in style; and the early encomia of Isocrates and others were obviously calculated to reveal the orator's agile mind no less than his titillating tongue. Even in the Second Sophistic, unique analysis of the topic, along with exceptional organization, memory, and delivery, played a part in impressing the audience; though style was emphasized, every avenue of display was explored and employed.

To my knowledge, no classical theorist specifically limits display to style. Ornamentation, one of the four major classical qualities of rhetorical style (the others: purity, clarity, and appropriateness), was one of the principal vehicles of display and was emphasized by most ancient theorists, but it was never considered the exclusive property of epideictic nor its sole distinctive feature. Aristotle, in particular, does not include a serious treatment of ornamentation in his *Rhetoric*. In his discussion of rhetorical style he is primarily con-

[15] See iii. 16. 1, 2 on using narration to reveal the credibility, nature, and importance of an act; also iii. 17. 3 on using amplification as a form of proof.

[16] See particularly Cope, Introduction, p. 22 and Médéric Dufour, *Aristote Rhétorique*, I (Paris, 1932), 44.

[17] My principal source of information is from a review of F. J. Schwaab's dissertation, "Uber die Bedeutung des *genos epideiktikon* in der Aristotelischen Rhetorik" (Wursburg, 1923) by Engelbert Drerup in *Philologische Wochenschrift*, XLIII (1923), 745-748. There Drerup spends as much time discussing Oskar Kraus' concept of epideictic as in reviewing Schwaab's dissertation.

cerned with clarity and appropriateness[18]—worthy qualities, but hardly havens of display.

Actually, display may be embraced in the phrase, "art for art's sake"; the orator who succumbs to this disease reveals the symptoms, in varying degrees, in every aspect of his preparation and performance. In epideictic oratory the symptoms are revealed in invention as readily as in style, for the audience has an opportunity to view and appreciate the selection of ideas and methods of amplification that are so stressed in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as well as in all classical epideictic theory. In fact, according to Aristotle, an epideictic oration is *akribestatē*[19]—which means that the oration is characterized, as Cope translates it, by a "nicer accuracy and higher degree of polish and finish"[20] than that of either the deliberative or forensic kinds. This "finer accuracy" permits the auditor to appreciate fully both the orator's stylistic efforts toward clarity and appropriateness, as well as his inventive genius in praising, for example, a person or object that is worthy of little, if any, commendation.

To summarize, Aristotle's third class of oratory is *epideiktikon,* not because it is necessarily wanton sophistic display, but, if we have rightly interpreted him, because the speaking occasion and subject matter peculiar to praising and blaming allow for a greater attention to all the facets of rhetorical art.

3.

Aristotle's dualistic concept of epideictic dominated the early Latin rhetorical treatises. Both Cicero and the *Auctor ad Herennium* follow, with disappointingly little reflection, the basic outlines of epideictic as set down by Aristotle. In the *ad Herennium* and the works of Cicero epideictic is designated as the oratory of praise and blame.[21] In fact, a Latin term that Cicero particularly favors to represent the Greek *epideiktikon* is *Laudatio*—praise. Even in *De Oratore* where he disparages Aristotle's division of oratory, Cicero still considers epideictic, or *Laudatio,* to be concerned with the praise of the "good points of a human being."[22] Epideictic is also considered by these rhetoricians as the prime avenue of rhetorical display. The *Auctor ad Herennium* descriptively refers to this class as *Demonstrativus,* the oratory of display or demonstrative oratory. And though our author says little about what is to be displayed when we praise or blame, he does write that "A narrative based on the persons should present a lively style. . . ."[23] Also, he later adds that homoeopton, homoeoteleuton, and paronomasia, figures of diction that reveal much labor, are "more suitable for a speech of entertainment than for use in an actual cause."[24] Consequently we may assume that clever development, or whatever else it is that makes the speech "entertaining," and ornamentation in style are both means of rhetorical display.

Cicero also maintains that epideictic oratory is admirably suited for display. He counsels the orator to "employ new coinages or archaisms or metaphors . . . [and] frequent repetitions of parallels and similes and contraries and doublets and rhythmic periods. . . ."[25] And Ci-

[18] See especially iii. 2.
[19] iii. 12. 2, 5.
[20] Cope, *Introduction,* p. 324.
[21] *Rhetorica ad Herennium* i. 2. 2 and, e.g., *De Inventione* i. 5. 7, and *De Partitione Oratoria* 21. 70.
[22] ii. 10. 45, trans. E. W. Sutton (Cambridge, Mass., 1948).
[23] i. 8. 13, trans. Harry Caplan (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).
[24] iv. 23. 32, trans. Caplan.
[25] *De Partitione Oratoria* 21. 72, trans. Harris Rackham (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).

cero, who never considers himself an epideictic orator,[26] also believes that serious thought is foreign to this oratory of praise and display, for as he says, "It is the proper field for Sophists . . . and is fitter for the parade than for the battle. . . ."[27]

4.

Beginning in the first Christian century this neat two-dimensional definition of epideictic begins to break down. The epideictic class still embraces all oratory that is dominated by praise and blame (e.g., funeral orations, panegyrics, special rhetorical exercises), but it is no longer considered the principal avenue of display by the theorists. A reading of Seneca's *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* reveals that the treatment of the forensic and deliberative themes in the declamations is also characterized by display. Seneca writes that: "He who prepares a declamation, writes not to excel but to please. . . . For he wishes them to approve him and not his case. Moreover, this fault follows declaimers even into the forum. They desert the necessary to run after the brilliant."[28] Tacitus also notes that their themes are both unnatural and "set forth in magniloquent phraseology. . . ."[29] And Pliny observes that even in the court one is faced with the "unmanly elocution" and "sing-song oratory"[30] of the declaimers.

Quintilian, though writing, in part, to counteract the extravagant tendencies of his day, reveals the effect this trend had upon all oratory. For him the epideictic genre still embraces praise and blame, but display, though greatly emphasized in epideictic, is no longer considered peculiar to this kind of discourse. In presenting the three major divisions of rhetoric, Quintilian writes:

> There is . . . one kind concerned with praise and blame, which, however, derives its name from the better of its two functions and is called laudatory [*laudatio*]; others however call it demonstrative [*demonstratio*]. Both names are believed to be derived from the Greek in which the corresponding terms are encomiastic [*engkomiastikon*] and epideictic [*epideiktikon*].[31]

Quintilian, fearing that the term *demonstratio* might be understood as the logical demonstration of the subjects' virtues or vices, feels that epideictic, when referring to display, is better represented by the Latin *Ostentatio*. In fact he goes so far as to claim that this oratory of praise, blame, and ostentation frequently "aims solely at delighting the audience. . . ."[32] But he also admits, and this is of paramount importance, that epideictic is not the exclusive vehicle of ostentation. He writes, "while there are three kinds of oratory, all three devote themselves in part to the matter in hand, and in part to display [*ostentatio*]."[33] In the first Christian century, then, it appears that epideictic is best considered praise and blame. Although at times it may contain proportionately more display than the other two kinds of discourse, the presence of display is no longer a differentiating characteristic.

5.

The treatises of the Second Sophistic represent the final stage in the transi-

[26] See, e.g., *Orator* 19. 65.

[27] *Orator* 13. 42, trans. H. M. Hubbell (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

[28] *Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae*, Preface to Book ix, trans. Ann Herrick, "Selections from the *Controversiae* of Seneca Rendered into English with an Introduction," M.A. thesis (Cornell University, 1932), pp. 47, 48.

[29] *Dialogus De Oratoribus* Ch. 35, trans. Sir William Peterson (Cambridge, Mass., 1920).

[30] *Letters* ii. 14, trans. William Melmoth, revised by W. M. L. Hutchinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1923).

[31] iii. 4. 12.

[32] viii. 3. 11; cf., however, iii. 7. 1-3 where a more moderate position is taken.

[33] iii. 4. 14.

tion of the term epideictic. However, epideictic, rather than meaning display, now refers to a kind of oratory that is best characterized as praise and blame. In the Second Sophistic, display was very much a part of all oratory and was useless, therefore, as a criterion for classification. Display still dominated epideictic as a perusal of such orations as those by the Emperor Julian or the Latin Panegyrists well show. But through Lucian, Philostratus, and Eunapius we note that the declamations, as well as forensic and deliberative oratory, are also dominated by rhetorical virtuosity.

The theorists of the day were greatly concerned with the progymnasmata of the schools, and epideictic oratory for deliberative and forensic theory no longer dominated rhetoric. However, the progymnasmata of such men as Hermogenes, Theon, and Aphthonius, although including exercises on praising and blaming, contain little that defines an epideictic class of oratory. In the other principal treatises, the *Ars Rhetorica,* doubtfully attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[34] and the two works on epideictic associated with Menander Rhetor,[35] there are extended lists of epideictic forms. The *Ars Rhetorica* contains seven forms of epideictic, and the works of Menander discuss the praise of gods and locations, in the first treatise, and have sixteen separate forms of epideictic discourse in the second. The treatises are designed to aid the speaker in invention, disposition and, infrequently, in style. Here the concept of epideictic is praising; nowhere is display discussed as a peculiar distinctive of this class of oratory. In fact Menander Rhetor, in the introduction to his first treatise, states that the mastery of these forms of praise readies one for "combat, not exhibition."[36] By this he means to set the functional panegyric apart from the typical sophist's overt display of knowledge and rhetorical ability.

6.

On the basis of this review of classical theory, it can be concluded that the dominant concept of epideictic was oratory of praise and blame. True, prior to Aristotle, epideictic apparently described a form of oratory characterized by display. But from the time Aristotle united *epideiktikon* with the rhetorical functions of praise and blame (to identify his third class of oratory) the term stood primarily for praise and blame and only secondarily for display. In fact, during the Roman Empire the interpretation of epideictic as display was of practically no service in distinguishing between classes of oratory.

Aristotle's anchoring of epideictic to the firmer ground of rhetorical functions was indeed a forward step in the practice of speech classification. Many deliberative and forensic addresses of even Aristotle's day employed art for art's sake,[37] and distinction among the

[34] The work was formerly ascribed to Dionysius but is now generally accepted as belonging to the second Christian century.

[35] The name Menander Rhetor has been linked to both treatises but it is generally acknowledged that he wrote only one. Which work may be properly ascribed to him has never been satisfactorily established. See J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship,* 2nd ed., I (Cambridge, 1906), 338, where he writes: "The name of Menander is also borne by two treatises still extant, the first of which is ascribed by Bursian to Menander and the second to Genethlius, while these ascriptions are reversed by Nitsche." See also Alfred and Maurice Croiset, *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque,* V (Paris, 1895), 728, 729.

[36] *Rhetores Graeci,* III, ed. Spengel, 331, particularly lines 15-18.

[37] A. W. Pickard-Cambridge (*The Public Orations of Demosthenes,* I [Oxford, 1912], 22) writes that a deliberative oration in the time of Demosthenes "appealed to the people as a performance, no less than as a piece of reasoning. . . ." Elsewhere he notes that "so

several kinds of oratory was virtually impossible when display was considered the sole property of epideictic.

The dissident may correctly argue that there was generally more display in epideictic than in the other kinds of discourse, but such a quantitative standard of classifications is confronted by those forensic and deliberative "exceptions" that, in their unconcealed use of art, rivaled the eulogies. If display were the final criterion it would be difficult to classify and distinguish between a funeral oration by a Lysias and a forensic address by a sophist of the Second Sophistic—such as Prohaeresius who, in pleading his defense, so effectively described the sufferings encountered in jail, praised Julian, and argued, that "the proconsul bowed his head and was overcome with admiration of the force of his arguments, his weighty style, his facility and sonorous eloquence."[38] (The speech was so impressive that even the opposition applauded!)

Epideictic must remain, for all practical purposes, oratory that is dominated[39] by either praise or blame. Present-day interpretation and usage that indiscriminately employs epideictic as a covering term for all non-deliberative and non-forensic oratory (whether or not it is characterized by praise or blame), or for a general oratory of display, is without adequate classical foundation.

great was their interest in the performance, that it was often the only interest (*Demosthenes,* ed. J. R. Green [London, 1911], p. 130). . . ."

[38] Eunapius, *Lives of the Philosophers,* 484, 485, trans. W. C. Wright (Cambridge, 1952).

[39] The epideictic oration needn't be given over wholly to the functions of praise and blame. The ancient orators were prone to blend several functions in a given oration. Theodore Burgess (*Epideictic Literature,* p. 109) notes that Nicolaus Sophista (5th cenutry A.D.) believes "other material besides praise and blame may be properly introduced into this class [epideictic] of oratory. . . ." For the use of praise and blame in deliberative and forensic oratory see *Orator* 62. 209, 210 and *Rhetorica ad Herennium* iii. 8. 15.

THE FORUM

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

REPORT OF ELECTION

All terms begin January 1, 1962.

Second Vice-President

Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State Univ.

Members of Administrative Council

Frederick Haberman, Univ. of Wisconsin
Jack Matthews, Univ. of Pittsburgh

Regional Representative to The Legislative Assembly

Central Area

G. Bradford Barber, Illinois State Normal Univ.
William Conboy, Univ. of Kansas
Robert L. Scott, Univ. of Minnesota
Edward Stasheff, Univ. of Michigan

Eastern Area

Wofford Gardner, Univ. of Maine
Almon Ives, Dartmouth College
E. Winston Jones, Boston Univ.
Kathryn Mulholland, Brooklyn College

Southern Area

Allen Bales, Univ. of Alabama
M. Blair Hart, Univ. of Arkansas
Francine Merritt, Louisiana State Univ.
Roy Tew, Univ. of Florida

Western Area

Donald Klopf, Univ. of Hawaii
Oliver W. Nelson, Univ. of Washington
George K. Sparks, Univ. of Arizona
Glenn Starlin, Univ. of Oregon

Representatives-At-Large in The Legislative Assembly

Raymond S. Beard, State Univ. College of Educ., Cortland, N.Y.
Gifford Blyton, Univ. of Kentucky
Martin T. Cobin, Univ. of Illinois
Rupert Cortright, Wayne State Univ.
Donald Ecroyd, Michigan State Univ.
Seth Fessenden, Orange Co. State College, Fullerton, Calif.
Iline Fife, Pennsylvania State Univ.
Wallace Fotheringham, Ohio State Univ.
Robert P. Friedman, Univ. of Missouri
Harold O. Haskitt, General Motors Institute, Flint, Mich.
S. I. Hayakawa, San Francisco State College
Mary E. Latimer, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va.
Leroy Lewis, American Institute of Banking, New York City
Patricia McIlrath, Univ. of Kansas City
Joseph H. Mahaffey, Air Univ., Maxwell Field, Ala.
Roger E. Nebergall, Univ. of Oklahoma
Roy Nelson, Colorado State Univ.
Joseph O'Rourke, Wabash College
Upton Palmer, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara
Waldo Phelps, Univ. of California, Los Angeles
Edyth M. Renshaw, Southern Methodist Univ.
John T. Rickey, Purdue Univ.
David B. Strother, Univ. of Washington
William S. Tacey, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Gordon Thomas, Michigan State Univ.
Sylvester Toussaint, Colorado State College of Educ.
Wm. S. Vanderpool, Grinnell College
Edna West, Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, La.
Garff B. Wilson, Univ. of California, Berkeley
George P. Wilson, Jr., Univ. of Virginia

ROBERT C. JEFFREY
Executive Secretary

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SAA CONSTITUTION

1. An amendment extending the term of the secretaries of Interest Groups from one year to two years.

   An amendment to strike out in line 2 of Article X, Section 6, the words "one year," and to insert the words "two years."

2. Amendments providing for three-year terms for members of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards.

   (a) An amendment to insert in line 3 of Article X, Section 8, following the words "to serve," the words "a three-year term."

   (b) An amendment to insert in line 5 of Article XI, Section 4, following the words "Executive Vice-President," the sentence "Members shall be elected for

three-year terms except that in the first election following the adoption of this amendment one third of the members shall be chosen for one-year terms, one third for two-year terms, and one third for three-year terms, the Executive Vice-President having the power and the responsibility to assign the varying lengths of terms to the respective Interest Groups."

3. Amendments providing that each Interest Group shall elect an alternate for its Delegate to the Legislative Assembly.
   (a) An amendment to insert in line 3 of Article X, Section 8, following the word "Assembly," the words "one alternate for the Delegate to the Legislative Assembly."
   (b) An amendment to strike out in line 4 of Article X, Section 4, the word "and," and to insert in line 5 following the word "Assembly," the words "and an alternate for the Assembly Delegate."
4. An amendment extending the term of Interest Group Delegates to the Legislative Assembly from one year to two years.
   An amendment to insert in line 3 of Article X, Section 8, following the words "Legislative Assembly," the words "for a term of two years."

WAYNE N. THOMPSON, *Chairman*
SAA Committee on Constitutional Revision

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS

To All Members of SAA:

If you have ideas on how to improve the SAA in any particular or how to extend its influence, why not shape them into the form of parliamentary resolutions and submit them for consideration by the Legislative Assembly when it convenes in New York next December?

The Legislative Assembly, I remind you, is based on the theory that the members of the Association should have a voice in the affairs of the organization. Its most important function therefore is to receive through channels such resolutions as members propose, and to debate them. But the theory falls if members fail to exercise their constitutional privileges.

Interest in "doing something" for the good of the cause—to improve some feature of the organization, to take new directions, or to urge whatever seems imperative at the time—tends to be highest just before, during, or immediately after a convention, then recedes once we're back in the old routine. To sustain the strong sense of professional-mindedness that we build up through conventions, would it not be a good idea if members of each Department of Speech devoted an occasional meeting to the status of the profession and our professional organizations? If a department is too large for the kind of informal, free-wheeling discussion called for, why not establish an *ad hoc* committee?

As most of you undoubtedly know, any action recommendations may be initiated by one member of the SAA, two or more members, or by any officially constituted group. Confine your proposal to one page and follow these procedures in drafting it:

To: Legislative Assembly
From: Name of person(s) sending the resolution
Parliamentary Statement of Action Desired: Resolved: (Give a clear, specific, and brief statement.)
Supporting Material: (What is the need for the proposed action? What results may be expected? What known support for the resolution exists? In short, supply whatever factual information and indications that will help the Assembly in its decision.)

Send ten copies of your resolution to the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee or to any of its members:

Milton Dobkin, Chairman
Humboldt State College
Arcata, California

Elton Abernathy
Southwest Texas State College
San Marcos, Texas

Coleman C. Bender
Emerson College
Boston, Massachusetts

Eleanor Luse
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

Wayne C. Minnick
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

The deadline for receiving resolutions is six weeks before the 1961 convention; the best time for brain cudgeling is now.

ERNEST J. WRAGE
Second Vice-President

NEW INTEREST GROUP

To the Editor:

In accordance with Article V, Section 1, of SAA By-Laws, I am enclosing a statement of intention to organize an Interest Group in Freedom of Speech, and I am hereby requesting that you publish this statement, along with the list of signatures, in the October issue.

FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN
Northwestern University

The undersigned members of the Speech Association of America hereby declare their intention of organizing an Interest Group in Freedom of Speech.

It shall be the purpose of this group to stimulate interest in problems of freedom of speech in our society, to encourage research and course offerings in this area, and to exchange knowledge on the subject among the members of the association and with other professions with a particular interest in these matters.

FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN
STANLEY PAULSON
EUGENE E. REBSTOCK
Sponsoring Committee

LLOYD E. CRISP
HERBERT C. FEINSTEIN
CLYDE L. STITT
MARK S. KLYN
WOODROW BORAH
ROBERT L. BELOOF
DON GEIGER
LEO LOWENTHAL
HERMAN COHEN
W. SCOTT NOBLES
ALVIN GOLDBERG
GEORGE A. SANBORN

FREE SPEECH AND SAA

To the Editor:

The Cohen et al. "interest group" which offers to sponsor a program on Free Speech at the 1961 convention deserves the Association's thanks. The group states the need well. Our conventions will not be better conventions just because we add another interest group. The question raised in the April 1961 issue of The Forum is why haven't we had such a program before. The letter to the Editor from Cohen and his colleagues notes, correctly, that such an interest group would be the concern of the entire membership of SAA. I agree most heartily.

Zachariah Chafee, Jr. said in his *Thirty-Five Years with Freedom of Speech* (New York, 1952), enthusiasm or even interest in the importance of free speech is an acquired taste, like olives. It's time we took our first big bite.

If Cohen's letter to the Editor was an invitation to join, I'd like to do so.

ARTHUR J. BRONSTEIN
Queens College

EDITOR'S NOTE: A program, "Problems in Freedom of Speech," is scheduled for the SAA December convention in New York. Four interest groups are sponsoring the section meeting.

A PATRIOTIC FILM?

To the Editor:

Nothing less than a storm has been generated at the University of Washington because of the filmstrip *Communism on the Map,* currently being shown throughout the Seattle area. A special viewing on the campus for the faculty January 24, 1961, resulted in a petition of protest signed by ninety-two professors, which was sent to the two major Seattle newspapers. Nearly all of the faculty members who attended the showing endorsed the petition. Outside the university, their action received public and private deprecation. Because they apparently objected to a presentation which was purportedly anti-communist, the professors, it seemed, were revealing pro-communist tendencies. On January 25 the strip was to be rerun in the University's Guggenheim Auditorium for the benefit of the student body. Aisles and exits, however, were so jammed by persons unable to

find seats that the safety marshal canceled the event, amid boos and catcalls expressing disappointment. A later showing was successfully arranged in a larger hall.

The documentary, which runs just over an hour, consists of slides and soundtrack, both of which are expertly composed and skillfully integrated. In the beginning communism is credited with control or extensive influence over the entire globe except for Switzerland, Formosa, West Germany, and the United States. The denouement pictures this nation as being isolated in a world dominated by Marxists. Red arrows of communism extend across the border from a communist-riddled Canada into Washington D. C. Fifth columnists, it is implied, have been influential on the White House staff and in Congress.

Though the filmstrip is replete with facts and testimony from well-known and respected newspapers, magazines, and books, half-truths and outright falsehoods are abundant. History is painfully distorted, and *non sequitur* conclusions are drawn from eminently authoritative but irrelevant sources. It was the general opinion of the faculty petitioners that communism should be opposed with the truth. If one must lie to defend his philosophy, he is admitting weakness.

Two somewhat general solutions develop. (1) We must pass some laws, and (2) we must resist further centralization of government. The over-all theme of the presentation seems ostensibly to be: "Let's all work together to fight the menace of communism." Paradoxically, however, an opposite central idea emerges to dominate the one stated above. Almost subliminally the viewer gradually develops the impression that, because nearly the whole world is under the hegemony of the Reds and because they have infiltrated our national government at the highest levels, it is simply a matter of time before we too must yield to the irresistible force of Marxist doctrine.

Giovanni Costigan, professor of history at the University of Washington, described the probable effect of the picture upon an uninformed person as: "(1) to convince him that our allies in NATO are worthless; (2) to breed distrust of our democratic institutions on the score of their inability to resist communism, and hence (3) to prepare public opinion for military control, the very thing against which Mr. Eisenhower warned in his farewell address to the nation." Professor Costigan added that the filmstrip says that Prime Minister Nehru, and with him India, is virtually under communist control; that Venezuela is a communist satellite and President Betancourt a friend of Castro; that the Republic of Ireland is on the brink of bankruptcy and deep in socialism with communist cells in spots which could take over in a crisis; that Hawaii is almost controlled by Communists, on the strength that there are some members of the Party in the labor unions there; that democratic socialism in Britain, Scandinavia, Israel, and India is nearly identical with communism. Worst of all, appeals to fear, suspicion, and hatred dominate the production, complains the history professor. Professor Costigan has suffered considerable public disapproval. His loyalty to the United States has been impugned, his nameplate was torn off his office door at the university, and he has received threats upon his life.

Perhaps if the strip had not had such an extensive audience in our area, the matter could be ignored. Seattle, however, in seven months has been saturated with it, largely because of the efforts

of the Boeing Aircraft Corporation, the Missionary Film Service, and the Sand Point Naval Air Station. Though the presentation has been officially banned from the Seattle public school system, a movie theater in the downtown area and the city's largest television station have made it available to everyone here.

Interesting is the fact that many of the officers of the Sand Point Naval Air Station, which is located in Seattle, believe that the filmstrip is an excellent device for combatting communism. In Washington D. C., the United States Navy has purchased thirty copies of the documentary for its stations throughout the country and abroad.

Boeing's Community Relations Office has been especially enthusiastic about the reception the picture got when it was made available at periodic intervals to the company's 50,000 workers. Employees, the Office reported, packed the theaters in which it was presented; and more than 100 requests have so far been received from them to show the filmstrip at PTA meetings and elsewhere.

The Seattle Missionary Film Service has had many more requests for the strip than could be filled. The appeals have come from ministers and church associations, youth and service clubs, PTA groups, fraternities, schools and colleges, business and professional organizations.

The Northwest Chapter of the American Council of Christian Churches adopted a resolution in January, 1961, recommending that the filmstrip be shown "in order to alert our people concerning the clever tactics of communism." The Reverend Ralph E. Waud of the Bellevue First Baptist Church has entered the local forum here in favor of the presentation. "We are 115 per cent for it," he said. "We feel that it is an excellent medium to shock Americans alert."

The source of the production is worth noting. It was made by an organization which calls itself the National Education Program, with headquarters at 815 Center Street, Searcy, Arkansas. Chairman of the group is George S. Benson, who is also president of Harding College at Searcy. Kenneth A. McDonald, Seattle attorney, stated in a public debate that some of the material for *Communism on the Map* came from the *Blue Book* of the John Birch Society. P. C. Beezley, chairman of the Birch Society in the state of Washington, corroborated that the producers of the filmstrip "did use some of Bob Welch's material—why shouldn't they?" Recently a series of articles on the John Birch Society appeared in the Portland *Oregonian,* in which the Society's chief coordinator for the state of Oregon was interviewed. In describing some of the methods employed by the Birch Society for recruiting new members, he stated that one of the most effective was the showing of the filmstrip, *Communism on the Map.*

The purpose of this communication is not to enlist support against the picture but rather to urge the reader to watch for it in his own community. The filmstrip has remarkable pedagogical and research possibilities. You will find it to be a fascinating case study inviting your scrutiny and analysis from the standpoint of propaganda, suggestion, emotional appeals, reasoning, and other aspects of persuasion. It is masterfully prepared. The awesome silence of the many audiences which have viewed it here in Seattle is testimony to that.

WALTER W. STEVENS
University of Washington

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

DUSK OR DAWN: NEW BOOKS ABOUT FILM

Henry L. Mueller

Evidently even film magnates accept the popular supposition that in the last half of the twentieth century there is no room for both television and film, for housing developments and oil fields now occupy sites in Hollywood where sound stages once stood. If the motion picture is indeed moribund, why have so many books on the subject rolled off the presses during the last three or four years? These are not only new books; they include reprints (often in relatively inexpensive paperback editions) of works (e.g., Rudolf Arnheim's *Film as Art*, Eisenstein's and Pudovkin's essays) which have achieved the stature of classics in the study of the screen arts. Possibly scholars who considered the film beneath academic contempt when the movies were one of the most profitable industries in the United States feel that in their reputed decline they have become respectable, for the history of any movement (however frivolous or licentious it may have been while it flourished) is academically aseptic. That hypothesis might account for scholarly (and pseudo-scholarly) works; it does not explain the even more numerous journalistic books which continue to appear. Their emergence may be due to a national nostalgia for the era between the two World Wars, which in retrospect seems to have been comparatively serene and uncomplicated; Americans have always had an avid appetite for sentimental and inaccurate reconstructions of the recent past. A much more likely explanation is that the growing concern with the film is an indication that television's ultimate effect on the moving picture will be to re-vitalize it and to define its scope and function with some degree of precision, much as radio, after apparently destroying the phonograph industry, ultimately stimulated it to a growth it might never have achieved in the absence of a competitor and apparent conqueror. However entertaining it may be to speculate on whether the motion picture is rapidly receding into history or is on the eve of a renaissance, there are several recent books (of varying levels of interest and authenticity) with which students of the screen arts should be familiar.

Foremost among these is Siegfried Kracauer's *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. Except for Seymour Stern's authorized biography of D. W. Griffith (on which the author has been working for at least thirty years), no other book on the film has excited so much interest in advance of publication. Frances Flaherty, Paul Rotha, and others who read all or part of the work in manuscript reported that it would be the definitive treatise on the aesthetics of the film; its publication

Mr. Mueller is Associate Professor of Speech, University of Illinois. He was editor of The Speech Teacher, *1955-57.*

would render unnecessary any further study of the subject, regardless of any new technical or artistic developments. Probably no book could live up to the anticipation which such preliminary reports created; it would be unjust to find fault with *Theory of Film* because it is something less than the author's friends proclaimed it to be. Too often we criticize a work because it does not conform to our preconceptions of it; to be fair it is necessary to judge a book, not in terms of expectation, but according to the author's purpose, insofar as he states it explicitly or implies it sufficiently for the reader to infer it with sureness. Dr. Kracauer states his intent lucidly and laconically: "[The book's] exclusive concern is the normal black-and-white film, as it grows out of photography." This limitation and the one implicit in the sub-title are not so restrictive as they seem, for Kracauer does not devote his attention exclusively to the newsreel and the documentary. He distinguishes between the "recording" and "revealing" functions of the motion picture, according equal or perhaps even greater importance to the latter:

> . . . film is essentially an extension of photography and therefore shares with this medium a marked affinity with the visible world around us. Now this reality includes many phenomena which could hardly be perceived were it not for the motion picture camera's ability to catch them on the wing. And since any medium is partial to the things it is uniquely equipped to render, the cinema is conceivably animated by a desire to picture transient material life, life at its most ephemeral. Street crowds, involuntary gestures, and other fleeting impressions are its very meat. Significantly, the contemporaries of Lumière praised his films—the first ever to be made—for showing "the ripple of the leaves stirred by the wind."
>
> I assume, then, that films are true to the medium to the extent that they penetrate the world before our eyes . . . [page ix].

To keep his book within manageable scope for the reader as well as the writer, Kracauer excludes consideration of color, widescreen and three-dimensional processes, the animated cartoon, and television. If at first these exclusions seem arbitrary, the logic and necessity eventually become apparent. It becomes equally apparent that the author should have made another exclusion, consideration of the experimental film, for the conventional and the avant-garde are not appropriate to the same aesthetics. If Kracauer had written a history of the film, he would have had to include consideration of every use made of it, as a conscientious historian of the printing press would have to note, however briefly, that it can produce not only Bibles, but novels, dictionaries, biographies, belles-lettres, and mail order catalogs as well. No one would attempt to formulate a literary aesthetics which would encompass plays, poetry, and *Peyton Place* because each of them is printed from movable type and bound in conventional form, or an aesthetics of sculpture which comprehended the making of tombstones as well as of statues because stonecutters and sculptors both use mallets and chisels in their work. This confusion of the medium with the many manners in which its users may employ it is common in the works of lesser authors; it is surprising to find it in a writer of Kracauer's stature.

The flaws in *Theory of Film* do not in any way diminish its importance as a pioneer work. The meticulous research, the lucid organization, the style (truly scholarly, being neither dry nor austere, with many appealing humorous and human asides), the analogies (for clarity and not for exhibitionism) drawn from literature, painting, music, and other established arts, make the book pleasant to read and re-read, for all that it de-

mands the most energetic thought and attention. But this is not the definitive aesthetics of the film, for, just as systems of logic and philosophy depend far more than we realize upon the structure of the language in which the logician or philosopher does his thinking, so does an aesthetics depend upon the culture in which the critic perceives the art whose principles and characteristics he is attempting to formulate. Before, while, or after reading *Theory of Film* one should read or re-read Kracauer's earlier book, *From Caligari to Hitler.* The use of film in Germany from the defeat of der Kaiser through the regime of der Führer has inevitably colored his thinking. The conviction that the film-maker must follow the Lumière tradition (the "actualité") and reject the tradition of Méliès (the "féerie") is surely due to first-hand observation of how unscrupulously a totalitarian government can exploit the unique capabilities of the screen. One must respect this conviction, and recognize its source, but there is no compulsion to accept it, for it renders the film-maker a second-class citizen in the world of art by denying him the right to choose his subject-matter freely.

As an aesthetics for a very important segment of the screen, *Theory of Film* is eloquent and valid. One can only hope that the scholars who formulate the aesthetics of other and equally legitimate aspects of the film will write with Dr. Kracauer's erudition, authority, and humanity.

In his *The Screen Arts: A Guide to Film and Television Appreciation,* Edward Fischer addresses a different, but overlapping, audience. This book is not for the scholar and the critic, but for the viewer to whom the screen and the tube are among the most important sources of entertainment and enlightenment. The author states his purpose: "It is the hope of this book that it may lead the reader to a deeper appreciation of the good and the best in movies and television, and thereby make more enjoyable our regular excursions into the wonderful world of the screen arts." In seeking to achieve his purpose, the greatest contribution Professor Fischer makes is his demonstration that genuine appreciation is totally free from affectation and pretense; sincere enjoyment of the good is preferable to counterfeit liking of the best. In the sense that he makes the reader come to his own conclusions rather than spelling everything out for him, Professor Fischer is a provocative writer. Students in classes in the history and aesthetics of the screen may not really like this book, for it forces them to cogitate, instead of supplying them with convenient passages which they may memorize with ease and glibly parrot in recitation or examination. There is even suspense in the book; on occasion the reader fears that Professor Fischer's simplicity may descend to cuteness, as it comes perilously close to doing in those paragraphs in which he uses "icky." But the good old-fashioned horse-sense and lack of affectation are genuine. It is difficult to conceive of a reader either too unlettered or too sophisticated to read this book without both enjoyment and profit; it is only the most imperceptive reader who will conclude that so unassuming a book must be trivial.

Unlike *Theory of Film* and *The Screen Arts,* Parker Tyler's *The Three Faces of the Film: The Art, The Dream, The Cult* is not unitary. It is an anthology of eighteen essays on the film, fourteen of which have already appeared in periodicals ranging alphabetically from *The American Quarterly* to *The Sewanee Review* in the decade from 1948 to 1958. "Parker Tyler remains the only

widely-published and long acknowledged exponent of multilevel film criticism," announces the blurb. Evidently "multilevel criticism" is a combination of undisciplined free association and polysyllabic circumlocution with the apparent intention of making the obvious seem erudite. Mr. Tyler occasionally, and reluctantly, one must assume, pens a simple declarative sentence, but in general his sentences are long and unwieldy, bristling so with parentheses and subordinate clauses that an occasional predicate trails so far behind its subject that it fails to agree with it in number. Reading these essays is like decoding a complex cryptogram only to find that its content is scarcely worth the effort involved in determining it. One can always congratulate himself that few possess the skill and patience to extract the small kernel of meaning from the resistant husk which surrounds it, but it seems rather a pity to devote such ability to an activity of incommensurate importance. Like Kracauer, and Fischer, to a lesser degree, Tyler lards his pronouncements with references to accepted masterpieces in the traditional arts. To the suspicious reader, however, these citations seem less designed for exposition than for persuasion; in his aesthetic name-dropping Mr. Tyler seems to be offering nervous proof that his interest in the film is only a sort of intellectual slumming; he would hate for the reader to believe that a critic of the film is a regular moviegoer. This apparent insecurity makes the reader feel uncomfortable; it is a relief to finish the book and find oneself still respectable despite his indiscreet association with the infra dig. His peers respect Mr. Tyler, and often quote him; Kracauer, for example, cites his "brilliant interpretation" of *Rashomon*. These strictures probably are more indicative of a reader's blind spot than of Mr. Tyler's limitations as a critic.

The style of Jacob M. Landau's *Studies in the Arab Theater and Cinema* is as direct as Tyler's is tortuous. Landau assumes quite correctly that his reader is completely ignorant of the Arab theatre and cinema, and proceeds without any self-consciousness to provide basic information about these two popular entertainments in short unambiguous statements. In the artistic history of most countries, the stage and the screen have developed independently and in widely separated eras. But the Arab theatre did not derive from its European counterpart until the nineteenth century, and both stage and screen draw heavily on the primitive shadow plays which are the only indigenous Arab theatre. Hence the subject of Landau's book is not so lacking in unity as might appear. This study is a model of economical writing; without being elliptical, it compresses into just over two hundred pages a wealth of information of equal interest to the dabbler and the specialist. The format and organization of the book suggest that it is a doctoral dissertation; if it is, it is a rare one, for one reads it for its inherent interest, and not as part of his professional duty.

Evidently Landau's book did not come to Paul Rotha's attention when he was writing his "Epilogue: 1948-1958" for the third edition of his *The Film Till Now*; in his survey of world film production for that decade he makes no reference to the Arab film, although he does have a brief section on films of other countries of the East. *The Film Till Now* first appeared in 1929, in that crucial period when the "talkie" was displacing the silent film. A second edition (Mr. Rotha corrected his earlier errors of fact and opinion in footnotes) came out in 1949, with a supplementary

section, "The Film Since Then," by Richard Griffith. According to the title page of this third edition, it is "revised and enlarged," a claim which is only half true. If there was any alteration at all in the plates of the second edition before reprinting them, a random collation of some twenty pages has not revealed it. The enlargement consists of the "Epilogue" already referred to. In a little more than fifty pages, Mr. Rotha summarizes the film production in thirty-six different countries from 1948 to 1958. Unfortunately, *la nouvelle vague* rolled across the Channel and the Atlantic just after this summary went to press, so the account of contemporary French production ends on quite the wrong note. The "Epilogue" is inadequate not only because of the insufficient space Mr. Rotha (or his publisher) has allotted to it, but also because in too many instances he relies on secondary or even tertiary sources. The apologetic (or is it complacent?) parenthesis, "which I have not seen," follows so many titles the author cites that the reader begins to anticipate it like a running gag in a silent comedy. *The Film Till Now* nevertheless remains the best history of world cinema in English. (Georges Sadoul's untranslated *Histoire Générale du Cinéma* still is the best history of the film, despite its many errors due to carelessness and ignorance and its deliberate falsehoods.) The owner of the second edition of *The Film Till Now* has no need of the third if he makes any attempt at all to keep abreast of contemporary production.

From its title, the prospective reader of Ezra Goodman's *The Fifty-Year Decline and Fall of Hollywood* might well conclude that here is a new national history of the film to supplement the various world histories; for a long time there has been need of a book which would bring up to date the history that Lewis Jacobs began with his *The Rise of the American Film*. Once one reconciles himself to reading a movie column inflated to book proportions instead of a serious chronological study of a unique aesthetic, historical, sociological, and anthropological phenomenon, he can immensely enjoy Mr. Goodman's book, particularly if he reads it desultorily—for that is the manner in which the author wrote it. A name or an incident reminds Mr. Goodman of some corresponding name or incident, and he skips blithely from one person, anecdote, or era to another, never hesitating to return to a subject even though he seems to have disposed of it fifty pages earlier. He does report several new items (to be manipulated as probabilities until independent references certify them as facts) useful to the serious student of the film, but for the most part *The Fifty-Year Decline and Fall of Hollywood* is just an extended gossip-fest. Like the best gossip, it is fundamentally wholesome and good-natured; the occasional bawdiness and spitefulness are merely condiments to add flavor, rather than being basic ingredients.

Garbo: A Biography by Fritiof Billquist has a title even more attractive to readers than Goodman's is; the style is just as gossipy and hearsay, although the chronology of Garbo's career provides Billquist with an organization and unity which Goodman never achieves. According to the publisher's announcement, Fritiof Billquist is a friend and former colleague of Garbo; it is only natural that the reader would expect this new account of the greatest film actress in history to provide insights into her artistry which have hitherto been unobtainable. But for all of the author's acquaintance with his subject, he pro-

vides less in this hypertrophied fan-magazine article than John Bainbridge did in his "profile" in *Life,* which he later expanded to book length. Bainbridge did not know Garbo, but he did know both Hollywood and New York. Billquist knows neither; his translator (and editors) must be equally ignorant. Some of the American scenes are so unconvincing that the reader must wonder if the action which takes place in Stockholm rings equally false to the Swedish reader. But Garbo is Garbo, and her fans would rather read an inferior work about her than not read about her at all.

The first projection of motion pictures on a screen of which there is a written record was William Kennedy Laurie Dickson's demonstration of the Kinetoscope (synchronized with a phonograph cylinder) to Thomas Alva Edison on October 6, 1889. Even in this most accelerated of ages, seventy-two years is an infinitesimal time for an art to evolve. For obvious reasons, the development of the history and criticism of an art must lag behind its evolution. Hence it is scarcely surprising that historical and critical studies of the art of the screen have not yet achieved the level of the history and criticism of those arts whose origins are prehistoric. Moreover, the film is the most eclectic and most complex of all arts, synthesizing selected principles from most of the arts which preceded it; the screen affects and is affected by economics, psychology, and sociology to a unique extent. Competent history and criticism of the art of the screen demands an "atomic man" who comprehends the arts, sciences, and issues of his day as thoroughly as the "Renaissance man" understood the traditions, discoveries, and movements of his age.

BOOKS REVIEWED

THEORY OF FILM: THE REDEMPTION OF PHYSICAL REALITY. By Siegfried Kracauer. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960; pp. xix+364. $10.00.

THE SCREEN ARTS: A GUIDE TO FILM AND TELEVISION APPRECIATION. By Edward Fischer. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960; pp. 184. $3.50.

THE THREE FACES OF THE FILM: THE ART, THE DREAM, THE CULT. By Parker Tyler. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1960; pp. 150. $6.95.

STUDIES IN THE ARAB THEATER AND CINEMA. By Jacob M. Landau. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1958; pp. xix+290. $6.00.

THE FILM TILL NOW: A SURVEY OF WORLD CINEMA, WITH AN ADDITIONAL SECTION BY RICHARD GRIFFITH. By Paul Rotha. (Third edition, revised and enlarged.) New York: Twayne Publishers, 1960; pp. 820. $15.00.

THE FIFTY-YEAR DECLINE AND FALL OF HOLLYWOOD. By Ezra Goodman. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961; pp. x+465. $5.95.

GARBO: A BIOGRAPHY. By Fritiof Billquist. Translated by Maurice Michael. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960; pp. 255. $4.50.

TO A YOUNG ACTRESS. THE LETTERS OF BERNARD SHAW TO MOLLY TOMPKINS: THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN BERNARD SHAW AND AN AMERICAN ARTIST FROM 1921 THROUGH 1949. Edited and with an Introduction by Peter Tompkins. New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1960; pp. 192. $8.50.

SHAW ON SHAKESPEARE: AN ANTHOLOGY OF BERNARD SHAW'S WRITINGS ON THE PLAYS AND PRODUCTION OF SHAKESPEARE. Edited and with an Introduction by Edwin Wilson. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1961; pp. xxii+284. $1.75.

The most striking aspect of the latest volume of Shavian letters—Shaw's letters to Molly Tompkins—is neither Shaw's wit nor his perception. It is the format of the book. The publisher has used the process of photolithography to reproduce the actual handwritten and typewritten letters. The superiority of this process is obvious; reading these letters becomes a much more personal, intimate, immediate, and delightful experience.

The letters reproduced in *To A Young Actress* were written by Shaw to Molly

Tompkins, who was more than forty years his junior, between 1921 and 1949. Not all of Shaw's letters to her are available; some have been lost, destroyed, or stolen. None of Mrs. Tompkins' letters to Shaw have survived. But although her letters are missing, her character is vividly created for the reader by Shaw's letters to her. A fascinating picture of "Sarah of Red Gulch," as he sometimes called her, emerges: a wealthy, pretty, and impetuous young American, a woman who asks his advice about an acting job without telling him what the job is, who sends him an importunate letter without bothering to jot down her return address, who writes a letter on both sides of transparent tissue paper with the result that each side makes the other illegible, and a woman sufficiently interesting to keep Shaw writing to her and advising her for more than a quarter of a century.

As the portrait of Molly Tompkins emerges with great clarity, so does another portrait, a new view of Shaw, a touching and sad picture of the delicate and considerate old man nearing the end, advising her to find younger correspondents, trying to make her realize, "The man you knew is dead." As one reads his letters, one notices the precise handwriting grow slightly—but only slightly—more shaky, the typewriting betray a few—but a perceptible few—more errors. It is a moving experience.

His advice to this novice on basic acting techniques—advice which is concerned almost solely with voice and diction—contains sound precepts on pitch, projection, diction, the reading of dramatic poetry, and even the proper use of the schwa vowel. He advises her on the business of acting as well as on the craft of acting, the use of make-up at interviews, the problem of unscrupulous managers, even the choice of a professional name. But Shaw's lectures go beyond the theatre, and extend to virtually every subject under the sun, from drainage to postal rates, from Soviet Russia to child-rearing, from how to develop a beautiful handwriting to how to catch a bat. And all of this is handled with the expected Shavian wit. (I especially prize a postcard on which is a reproduction of Rubens' *The Judgment of Paris*, with the three nude contestants labelled Dolly, Mrs. Clandon, and Gloria, and a notation that this is how *You Never Can Tell* should be costumed.)

These letters could have been annotated with long explanatory essays on each page. Instead, the comments show admirable brevity and restraint. Peter Tompkins wisely decided that "so much would have to be said for the benefit of those who know nothing of Shaw that would be redundant to Shavian enthusiasts that the letters are best left stand on their own." It is therefore puzzling that among the few references he explains are those to Ellen Terry, Mrs. Patrick Campbell, Granville Barker, Lillah McCarthy, and even Charlotte Frances Payne-Townsend—names which need no introduction to the Shavian enthusiasts to whom he addresses himself.

At the opposite end of the scale, from the point of view of both price and audience, is a paperback anthology of Shaw's Shakespearean criticisms. Except for use as a convenient reference, the Shavian scholar will be disappointed. There is little new material; less than a dozen pages come from generally unknown sources. More than seventy-five per cent consists of *Saturday Review* criticisms, prefaces, letters to Ellen Terry and Mrs. Patrick Campbell, *Cymbeline Refinished*, and *Shakes Versus Shav*. But this anthology does not aim to present hitherto undiscovered Shaviana for the scholar. Instead, it aims to collect and organize, from a variety of sources, Shaw's comments on Shakespeare. For the student who has had little or no exposure to Shaw the Critic, it is useful both for the insights it provides into Shakespeare and into Shaw. For those who think of G.B.S. as an egomaniac throwing barbs against his betters, it will reveal him as a unique and penetrating interpreter of Shakespeare. And for students of theatre, it will provide useful and provocative insights into Shakespearean production.

Wilson has organized the selections logically, and has prefaced them with a good and concise essay in which he places in clear perspective Shaw's attacks on Shakespeare as thinker, his analysis of Shakespeare's language, his battles against Bardolatry, and his denunciations of the way actor-managers mutilated the plays. There are several editorial omissions, but *Shaw on Shakespeare* is a good introduction to Shaw the Critic.

BERNARD F. DUKORE
University of Southern California

THE EXPERIMENTS OF SEAN O'CASEY. By Robert Hogan. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1960; pp. 215. $5.00.

Robert Hogan's *The Experiments of Sean O'Casey* examines the playwright's twelve full

length plays from *The Shadow of a Gunman* to *The Drums of Father Ned*. The approach to the plays, according to Hogan, is a structural study of their form. The result reads like a series of casual chats, enthusiastically written, but lacking the care one finds in a solid structural study, such as David Magarshack's *Chekhov the Dramatist*. Hogan gives the reader adequate warning of what to expect, however, when he suggests that someone should do a study ". . . backed up with a more serious critical consideration and a more careful close reading than this little book gives . . ." (p. 5).

Following this preparation for any disappointment in the study, Hogan differentiates between what he calls "traditional" and "experimental" play structure. He concludes that the traditional play dramatizes a direct or exterior action, and that the experimental play presents an indirect or interior action. In the traditional play, the main action takes place on stage. Hogan illustrates this with Jonson's *Volpone*. In the experimental play, an action concerned with the inner working of the characters evokes the audience's response, while the main action takes place off stage. Hogan illustrates this with Chekhov's *The Three Sisters*. Except for an ambiguous chapter on O'Casey's "style," the remainder of the book argues that O'Casey's works fit the experimental pattern.

The hypothesis seems satisfactory. But certain errors in fact make one suspicious of the development. Hogan states, for example, that in *The Shadow of a Gunman, Juno and the Paycock*, and *The Plough and the Stars*, O'Casey "proved that Chekhovian structure was *copyable* [italics mine] and capable of the greatest results." O'Casey had never read a play by Chekhov, nor had he heard of the Russian playwright at this time in his life. This is an unfortunate error, inasmuch as Hogan's main premise is built upon the untenable assumption that O'Casey started as a playwright by experimenting with Chekhovian structure. This is not to say that the essays are not good. Hogan's discussion of *The Plough and the Stars*, an excellent essay, is one of the better explorations of this particular play. But for the most part, Hogan's attempts to make O'Casey's plays fit a Chekhovian pattern leave me with transparent conclusions.

As with many of O'Casey's critics, Hogan fails to see the religious debate of *Within the Gates* as the organizational center, and hence, he finds one of O'Casey's finest experiments "monstrously dull" for the wrong reasons. Hogan's "system" breaks down completely in his analysis of *The Star Turns Red;* Chekhovian structure will not accommodate O'Casey's integration of dialectical materialism and dramatic action. However, on the basis of his enthusiasm for *Purple Dust, Cock-a-Doodle Dandy*, and *The Drums of Father Ned*, Hogan concludes finally that "O'Casey is eminently, ultimately, foremost, and sideways a man of the theatre." In any revised edition, I am sure Mr. Hogan will want to reconsider some of his hurried generalizations and uncertain attempts at wit. What saves the book for me is an energetic brightness in style which stimulates argument.

CLAYTON GARRISON
University of California, Riverside

STANISLAVSKY ON THE ART OF THE STAGE. Translated with an Introductory Essay on Stanislavsky's 'System' by David Magarshack. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961; pp. 311. $4.50.

This addition to the Stanislavsky literature in English serves the beginner as the clearest introduction to his "system" and furnishes the seasoned director and actor with new material and a review manual. With this book in hand, one can better resist the codified formalizations of the Method—as propagandized in this country—which are contrary to the creative organic nature of the system.

The introductory essay, based on the Russian originals, compresses the basic ideas of *My Life in Art* and *An Actor's Work on Himself* (*An Actor Prepares*). A study of the former and a condensation of the latter have long been needed. Stanislavsky did not always write with clarity and seldom with economy, but Mr. Magarshack's brilliant expository essay lucidly demonstrates the idea of subconscious creative work through conscious psychotechnique. Numerous quotations from the originals make it painfully clear that Mrs. Hapgood's translations of *An Actor Prepares* and *Building a Character* fail to convey many qualities and ideas of the author.

The System and Methods of Creative Art, a posthumous collection of lectures forming the center of the volume, includes admirable discussions of the purpose of a studio, early work on a role, preparation before performances, attention, the use of rhythm based on normal respiration, the selfishness of stage

fright, and the Seven Steps of Perfection. Although Stanislavsky speaks here with his usual romanticism, his personality reveals its infectious enthusiasm, gentle humor, great love of man, and infinite patience. This work possesses more fluency, naturalness, and clarity than any of his others, and it could prove to be the most useful. One wishes that Mr. Magarshack, or someone equally adroit, would provide translations of Stanislavsky's other works.

This little volume, Stanislavsky's only work with a thorough index, also contains appendices on stage ethics, improvisation in melodrama, and transcripts of five rehearsals of *Werther*. It encompasses the two main divisions of the system: Mr. Magarshack's essay treats inner and outer work on self, and Stanislavsky's works treat inner and outer work on a role. The whole emphasizes that Stanislavsky's system consists not of rigid rules to be applied indiscriminately, but of "an art that is every moment changing" and which must be applied differently by each actor.

SAM SMILEY
Evansville College

AMERICAN DRAMATIC LITERATURE: TEN MODERN PLAYS IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE. By Jordan Y. Miller. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961; pp. xiv+641. $6.75.

Professor Miller has assembled a "collection of modern American plays that meet, in one way or another, the demands of good literature, together with introductory materials suitable for use in teaching American drama on the college level." The plays, all dating since 1918, are: *The Little Foxes, Camino Real, Command Decision, Porgy, Biography, The Male Animal, The Member of the Wedding, Harvey, Desire under the Elms,* and *The Crucible*. These illustrate nine types of drama: modern realistic drama, departure from realism, mature war play, folk drama, high comedy, comedy with a purpose, comedy of sensibility, fantasy, and tragedy. The introductory materials consist of a sixty-page history of the American theatre from its beginnings, a selected list of the major dramas from Colonial times to 1918, selected bibliographies of historical materials concerning the theatre and the drama, and introductions to each literary type, each drama, and each author. Numerous study projects appear in each section.

It is easy for anyone to quarrel with another person's selection of plays for an anthology. Each instructor will probably regret the absence of some favorite play, but he should be pleased with several of this anthologist's choices.

Some theatre historians may raise an eyebrow at Miller's neglect of regional, metropolitan, and amateur theatre in his short historical sketch and also at his failure to include bibliographical references to some of the excellent unpublished historical studies. However, these should not be major objections to an elementary text devoted primarily to literary study.

The textual portions contain many helpful materials; unfortunately, some are written in a rather monotonous declarative style. On the other hand, the book is painstakingly compiled, attractively designed and manufactured. Some twenty illustrations add interest to the volume.

It should be an excellent textbook for a one-semester reading course in modern American drama for students who have little acquaintance with the theatre or drama. Instructors who offer this type of course will do well to examine it.

ELBERT R. BOWEN
Central Michigan University

EZRA POUND. By Charles Norman. New York: Macmillan, 1960; pp. xviii+493. $6.95.

There may be in time a more complete biography of Ezra Pound as new materials come to light, but it is not likely that a more comprehensive compilation could be made of what is now available, or that there will ever be a more fair-minded and unbiased study of this enigmatic and controversial poet than Mr. Norman has made. He has gathered a mass of materials from Pound's voluminous correspondence and other writings and from diaries, biographies, critiques, news reports, official documents, court records, and personal interviews—so great a mass that he has sometimes had difficulty in gluing them into narrative coherence. For the most part he refrains from interpretation and merely lets the facts speak for themselves. And they do speak.

Pound's education at Williams College and at the University of Pennsylvania, his vast erudition in comparative literature, his self exile, first to London, then to Paris and Rapallo, his gradual emergence as leader of the "new" poets of England and America, his encouragement and promotion of such important writers as Robert Frost, T. S. Eliot, William Carlos Williams, James Joyce, Mari-

anne Moore, and Ernest Hemingway, his countless ventures in founding and editing "little" magazines, his life-long obsession with monetary theory and his inability to reason logically about it (which seems to have led to his ultimate insanity, his adherence to Mussolini and Fascism, and his treasonous broadcasts during the war), his indictment for treason, his twelve-year detention in a Washington asylum, and his final release for return to Italy—all are clearly set forth and convincingly documented.

Though Mr. Norman does not attempt a thorough critique of Pound the poet (he modestly states that he has done little more than characterize the man), he quotes dozens of his poems, in whole or in part, and furnishes the always necessary explication of their method and meaning. He is at pains to recount Pound's extraordinary kindness to young artists and his frequent labors and sacrifices in their behalf, but he also makes clear his overweening arrogance, his habitual insults to friends and strangers alike, his crude manners and coarse, vulgar language. There is no doubt that Pound has had, and still has, a powerful influence on the other poets of his day, and Mr. Norman seems to feel that this influence has been good. But surely we need to consider carefully whether imitation of Pound's manner—his undisciplined stream-of-consciousness writing, his imagism without syntax, his utter contempt for clarity—is likely to improve the quality of modern poetry. All his life he carried on a vigorous campaign, noble in purpose, to obtain for art and artists greater recognition and respect. But when he tried to achieve this end by damning public indifference with all the violent and dirty expletives in six languages he used a method that defeated his purpose. He should have noted a statement by his best disciple, T. S. Eliot, that the greatest poets are those who have given the greatest pleasure to the greatest number and the greatest variety of people.

If Pound wrote, as Mr. Norman seems to believe, to raise the general level of culture, and not to please a narrow coterie of disciples, he was doomed to failure because of his unbelievable insensitivity to the public mind. For years to come, a host of literary detectives will swarm over his works, but the public, whose taste he presumably sought to improve, will not and can not read him.

W. M. PARRISH
University of Illinois, Emeritus

WORSHIP AND THEOLOGY IN ENGLAND: FROM WATTS AND WESLEY TO MAURICE, 1690-1850. By Horton Davies. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961; pp. xiv+355. $7.50.

Unfortunately, because of its forbidding title, many persons may avoid this handsome volume, which considers chiefly the liturgical rather than the theological or ethical aspects of Christian life and which represents a scholarly rather than a hagiolatrous orientation. For the student of homiletics, Professor Davies' book is requisite reading; for the teacher of speech, it is interesting and rewarding reading.

As stated by the author, his concern in this first of several projected volumes "is with the entire spectrum of Christian denominations as they thought about worship and developed their modes of worship from 1690 to 1850." After two preliminary chapters which present a splendidly lucid synoptic description of Anglican and Nonconformist traditions in worship and architecture during the entire period, the remaining chapters are disposed in three parts: "The Dominance of Rationalistic Moralism," 1690 to 1740; "The Dominance of Evangelism," 1740 to 1830; "The Dominance of Traditionalism," 1830 to 1850. Obviously, distressful problems of emphasis and proportion are posed by an attempt to cover within 315 pages of text, including a fifteen-page Introduction, the revaluation of worship in Protestant and Catholic churches during this span of 160 years. Nevertheless, most readers will probably agree that Professor Davies has maintained a pleasing and harmonious balance.

Speech students will be pleasantly surprised to find numerous references to oral communication, such as the following: an ecclesiological description of Georgian "auditory" churches which were designed in refutation of the Gothic style, for the purpose of enabling worshippers conveniently to hear and participate in the services as well as to see them; an estimation of the influence of Charles II upon sermon construction and delivery; contemporary reaction to the ghostwriting of sermons; a tracing of the variegated importance and nature of the sermon in the various denominations during different periods; an analysis of the little known but monumental *Horae Homileticae* which ran to twenty-one volumes and contained 2,536 sermon outlines; and, especially, an extensive treatment of the

preaching techniques of Wesley and Whitefield.

In view of the over-all excellence of this book, the reviewer offers with reluctance several reservations. Although better executed than most such treatments in other works, the rhetorical study of Wesley and Whitefield lacks sufficient depth and comprehensiveness. The image of Wesley emerges with clarity but with little change in the well-standardized lineament. Despite the author's apparent efforts to present an objective treatment of Whitefield, the image of that evangelist is well-scrubbed, if not white-washed. The witty, gentle, generous, cheerful, "able to get along well with all kinds of people" side of Whitefield's nature needs to be balanced by the recognition of his neuropsychotic tendencies as he compulsively and repulsively revealed them in his published journals, tracts, letters, and sermons. Finally, although the author treats in standard church history fashion the "philosophic temper of the times," the analysis is scarcely provocative and certainly unsatisfying to students of mass persuasion, economic determinism, and the psychology of revivalism and conversion.

Perhaps it is unfair to ask more of the author than he has given us. He has developed his theme in an attractive, pleasant, and erudite manner. His coverage is nicely balanced and comprehensive within his space limitations and his frame of reference. The printing, the binding, even the dust jacket are handsome, reflecting the tone of the book: competent workmanship, discriminating good taste—and decorum.

EUGENE E. WHITE
The Pennsylvania State University

A TREATISE OF SCHEMES AND TROPES (1550), and a translation of THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN, by Desiderius Erasmus. By Richard Sherry. A facsimile reproduction with an Introduction and Index by Herbert W. Hildebrandt. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1961; pp. xii+238. $7.50.

This reproduction is, like the original text, very difficult to read (gothic type design and echoes from Middle English); an edition in modern type would at least be legible. Photofacsimiles of the 1550 (Huntington Library) and the 1555 (British Museum) editions have been available, and there can be enough copies to satisfy the needs of the few who want to study this work in its original form. (Hildebrandt has reproduced the 1550 edition from a copy in the Bodleian, identical with the Huntington Library copy.)

In this facsimile, the Sherry text takes up 232 pages followed by the index of authors and index of figures.

The Introduction, our major concern here, consists of six pages (v-x) of general comment on this "representative of the stylistic school." Pertinent preceding works are dismissed in fourteen lines and subsequent works are discussed in twenty-three.

In addition to the fact that this Introduction is very brief, I should like to see more support for the generalizations. Perhaps Sherry does not represent the "stylistic school." For instance, there is early and direct evidence in both the 1550 (Bi) and 1555 (Aiii) editions that Sherry is writing within the classical framework as he seems to establish that perspective with, "A briefe note of eloqucion, the third part of Rhetoricke, whereunto all figures and Tropes be referred." The current Introduction acknowledges Sherry's reference to invention as a tool of amplification, but adds that "Arrangement, memory, and delivery are overlooked." The fact that Sherry chose to write an English series of schemes and tropes does not necessarily imply that he thereby "overlooked" other constituents, nor does it imply that "Rhetoric in Sherry's work has lost its ancient meaning." I do not understand how it loses its ancient meaning here any more than in the works of Mancinellus, Mosellanus, Susenbrotus, Erasmus, and many other compilers. Concentration on style is not, of itself, evidence that the writer does not accept the other traditional parts of rhetoric. (Sherry does not mention Ramus and, at this time, was almost certainly unaware of his existence.)

These observations may be made in quick summary. (1) For a more detailed analysis of Sherry's work, I recommend William Crane's Introduction to Henry Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* (London, 1593), published by Scholars' Facsimiles in 1954. (2) There is still no easy-to-read edition of Sherry. (3) The index to figures in the current volume is useful. (4) For a translation of the Erasmian essay, the Introduction notes a Woodward translation of 1904. My advice is to read it in preference to Sherry's.

RAY NADEAU
University of Illinois

THE WHORE'S RHETORICK: CALCULATED TO THE MERIDIAN OF LONDON AND CONFORMED TO THE RULES OF ART, IN TWO DIALOGUES. [By Ferrante Pallavincino.] New York: Ivan Oblensky, 1961 (Reprinted from the London edition of 1683); pp. 160. $3.50.

Surely it is no great step from Rhetoric the Harlot of the Arts, to Rhetoric the Art of the Harlots. Thus our author, a rebellious young Italian of the early seventeenth century, and his anonymous English translator of late in that century, have exploited superficially the popular art of verbal extravagance and more extensively the perennial lure of the lascivious and the prurient.

An aged whore, past her years of profitable practice, instructs a novice in the principles and practice of her profession, including the systematic "art to multiply insinuating words, and feigned pretenses to perswade, and move the minds of those men who, falling into their nets, do become the trophies of their victories." This art involves invention, disposition, elocution, memory, and "useful Rules how to regulate the external acts of the Body, which is no less necessary in this exercise than the modelling of the mind itself." "Invention is principally necessary in this art, to frame new pretexts, and a diversity of expressions, with reference to the circumstances of person, time and place: and to impose probabilities, or even things utterly false, as certain, and true." The reputation of rhetoric rises page by page: Elocution "is necessary to fit you on all occasions, to use ambiguous expressions, and for ornament sometimes, synonymous terms; to equivocate, vary and double, according to your fancy and the present circumstances." The game of analogy is interesting briefly, but it soon wears out.

Why is this book reprinted? There hardly seems an adequate answer, except perhaps its rarity. It is better printed and bound than one would expect for the sidewalk trade. The *Short Title Catalogue* lists one copy, at the Bodleian; the publisher alleges a second, in private hands. There is no bibliographical account except for an ambiguous Preface, and no suggestion that the book was originally a translation (free) from the Italian.

DONALD C. BRYANT
University of Iowa

UNCORKING OLD SHERRY: THE LIFE AND TIMES OF RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN. By Oscar Sherwin. New York: Twayne, 1960; pp. 352. $6.00.

I cannot accept this book as a serious contribution to Sheridan biography. A more indicative title would be "London Confidential; or, The Times of R. B. S.," for Sheridan plays a supporting role to milieu, the hero of the piece. Yet the virtue of colorful background material is limited, since the work contains exactly one footnote (p. 172). Despite an extensive bibliography, the failure to cite specific quotations, when so much of the book consists of anecdotes joined by explanation, will frustrate the serious student. Although the information is frequently entertaining, it can lead to wrong conclusions, because the author presents many of the old stories that cloud rather than clarify our picture of Sheridan.

Unfortunately, this work contains little insight into and less critical commentary on the man, either as a literary or a political figure, and even less on Sheridan's speaking. The verb trick of present tense throughout results in a loose, often confused, sequence. This distortion of time is most serious when the author has Sheridan representing Westminster before Fox dies (p. 312). Worse than the error of fact is the consequence, that Sheridan would have the impudence to compete with the leader of his party for the prized borough long held by that leader. Not only does the author quote with abandon, but he sometimes includes part of a quotation as his own words (e.g., "swindler," p. 307).

I quarrel most with the interpretation of Sheridan. Treating the elopement and duels in the form of a fanciful satire seems flippant. The pun in the title of the book is taken from the caption to the coarse political caricature illustrated on the jacket. The author seems unduly influenced by the low level of abuse in the cartoon, for his attitude betrays a lack of respect for the subject of the work. Rhodes, in *Harlequin Sheridan* (1933), presents the same condescending view, and was also influenced by caricatures (depicting Sheridan as a slovenly harlequin), but Rhodes presents it with authority. Sherwin has a feeling for the times, but little rapport with Sheridan. This cold-fish approach to biography would have succeeded had the author

compensated by probing, dissecting, and evaluating.

JEROME LANDFIELD
Oberlin College

THE SENATE SPEECHES OF W. B. YEATS. Edited by Donald R. Pearce. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960; pp. 183. $4.50.

During the first six years (1922-28) of the Irish Free State, William Butler Yeats, already distinguished as a man of letters, served as an appointed senator participating in what he described as "the slow exciting work of creating institutions." Critics and biographers have given scant attention to this phase of his career, and his senate speeches have remained buried in the official records. "This is doubly unfortunate," writes the editor of this volume, Donald R. Pearce, Associate Professor of English at the University of California, Santa Barbara, "because an accurate knowledge of his political career is essential not only for his biography but also for the light it sheds on his development as a poet."

Except for minor omissions, the fifty-five speeches and five appendices in this book give a complete chronological record of Yeats' senate service. The texts for the speeches come from the volumes of *Seanad Eireann* and were cross checked with the poet's personal copies of the same report in which he had made occasional marginal notations and interlineal revisions. Since Yeats frequently exercised his senatorial privilege of revising the record before it went to the printers, Professor Pearce considers this collection as "properly part of the canon of his published work."

In his Introduction, Professor Pearce gives a brief account of the political scene and the nature of the audience, but his major concern is with the effects of the senate experience on Yeats and his work. He makes no claims for these speeches other than as personal documents of the poet during one of his most productive periods. Although Yeats spoke on a variety of topics, his major addresses were in behalf of the arts and education and reveal his concern for unifying the new Ireland through culture. Students of the man will enjoy his speeches on the Irish Manuscripts Commission, the Lane paintings, education, copyright laws, and divorce, for these are abundant in personal references, philosophy, and prejudices. Those interested in the poetry of this period will find ideas later developed into verse. "Among School Children," for example, followed a visit to an Irish school while he was gathering evidence for speeches on reform in education, and "The Three Monuments" is akin to a bit of ridicule from the divorce speech in which Protestant Yeats pointed up the incongruity of the Irish Catholics asking for legislation against divorce on moral grounds while the main thoroughfare of Dublin, O'Connell Street, was dominated by statues of the three moral irregulars: Parnell, Nelson, and O'Connell.

Most readers will find Yeats the speechmaker a less exciting figure than Yeats the poet. Narrow in purpose, sometimes careless in arrangement, and undistinguished in style, his senate speeches are unlikely to win him a place among such Irish orators as Grattan, Curran, and O'Connell; yet, as Professor Pearce contends, they do shed light on his development as a poet.

JOSEPH O'ROURKE
Wabash College

THE CONFEDERATE CONGRESS. By Wilfred Buck Yearns. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1960; pp. viii+293. $5.00.

This is a thorough study of the Confederate Congress and its relationships to the administration of Jefferson Davis and the Confederate war effort. Descriptive chapter titles include "Life at the Confederate Capitals," "Mobilization of Manpower," "The Writ of Habeas Corpus," "Foreign Affairs," and "Financing the War." Nine pages of the Appendix give brief biographical data on Confederate congressmen, including symbols showing whether they usually voted for or against administration proposals.

The speaking of the Confederate Congress is treated sketchily at best. See for instance the brief discussion of the debates over conscription (pp. 68-72), the glance at campaign speaking (p. 44), and the brief analysis of issues in the Confederate Congress (pp. 49-53). Yearns cannot, however, resist the temptation to include such juicy tidbits as fights among members of the Congress, on and off the floor (p. 15).

The primary value of this book for students of American public address lies not in its description or analysis of congressional debating, for this is slighted. *The Confederate Congress* casts revealing light on the issues faced by the three Congresses: Provisional, First, Second.

In general, Yearns pictures a honeymoon between the Congress and the Davis administration during the early years of the war, an era of sweetness and agreement that gave way to bickering and criticism as the fortunes of the Confederacy declined. In his analysis of southern attitudes toward secession in the first chapter, Yearns minimizes more than some other authorities the differences among Southerners and the opposition to secession in the South.

Yearns' style is readable though not "popular," and the University of Georgia Press has produced a well edited, good looking volume. Publication of the book was aided by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

GREGG PHIFER
Florida State University

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1880. By Herbert J. Clancy, S.J. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958, pp. x+294. $3.20.

The Presidential Election of 1880 is a well written, thoroughly documented account of one of the bitterest and closest elections in American history; Garfield's margin was barely 7,000 out of a total of ten million votes cast. The book opens with a capsule review of political events from Lincoln's assassination through the compromised Hayes-Tilden election of 1876, thus setting the election of 1880 in its historical context. The pre-convention struggles for the Republican and Democratic nominations are reviewed in helpful detail. The Republican convention, "one of the most dramatic and historic conventions in all American history" (p. 88), is treated in some depth. There is excellent commentary on some of the decisive events of the convention: Garfield's reply to Conkling; the reasoning behind the decision not to use Ingersoll to nominate Blaine; Conkling's speech seconding Grant's nomination, "one which ranks with the classics of American political history" (p. 99). The Democratic convention that year was less exciting; Hancock was nominated on the second ballot. It took the Republicans thirty-six ballots to choose the dark horse, Garfield.

The conduct of the Democratic and Republican campaigns—the deals, the scandals, the religious issue, the charges and countercharges—are developed in depth. The role of third parties is considered briefly; (their effect on the outcome of the election was nil). Throughout the book the author draws heavily on contemporary sources, including diaries and private correspondence of the major figures.

This is a valuable resource book for the student of public address of this period. An excellent Bibliography suggests further avenues for study.

AUSTIN J. FREELEY
John Carroll University

POWER AND PERSUASION. By John Franklin Carter. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1960; pp. xii+200. $3.95.

Citing the effectiveness of the spoken word as "the basic political challenge of our times," Mr. Carter, a speech-writer for Dewey, Truman, and F. D. R., proposes to supply "an account of the development of political persuasion in twentieth-century America" and "to reflect faithfully the real character and meaning of political action in our free and vigorous society."

Under the heading, "The Basic Tool of Politics," Mr. Carter adduces electronics as a new era in persuasion and calls for rhetoric "to change its methods and theories." Except for some vague references to style, he neither characterizes the old nor prescribes for the new. His discussion of ghostwriting is replete with personal experiences and a list of the writers behind modern political speakers. His illustrations provide interesting insights into the rhetorical techniques of leading political speakers.

In "The Parts of Political Speech," Mr. Carter classifies speeches according to occasion and purpose, describing the stratagems of the inaugural, the message to Congress, the rally speech, and the address at the fund-raising dinner. A section on research throws light on the techniques of such research staffs as those of Dewey, Harriman, and Rockefeller. The author explains the "speech conference" and compares the methods of Dewey's conferences with those of Truman.

A unit called "Orchestrating Perpetual Crisis" is given to a discussion of supporting materials and psychological appeals. The rest of the book deals with non-rhetorical political methods.

The ambitious, even noble, purposes of the author shrivel until the book becomes a primer in rhetorical pragmatism. The implication is that "the basic political challenge of our times" must be met with sophistry. The deficient "account of the development of political persuasion" is further marred by the author's

failure to define terms, by irresponsible assertions on rhetorical as well as non-rhetorical matters, by the fact that his political inclinations warp his critical conclusions, and by flagrant self-contradictions within short paragraphs.

Despite these shortcomings, the book seems worth reading. It presents the rhetorical methods and philosophies of some of our leading politicians. Its insights into politics on the local level are fascinating, if frightening. Above all, its portrait of twentieth-century sophistry and its characterization of rhetoric as "performance" and "entertainment" offer grim evidence of the need for a generation of critical listeners.

WARREN E. WRIGHT
Hamilton College

ATTITUDE ORGANIZATION AND CHANGE: AN ANALYSIS OF CONSISTENCY AMONG ATTITUDE COMPONENTS. Milton J. Rosenberg, Carl I. Hovland, William J. McGuire, Robert P. Abelson, and Jack W. Brehm. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960; pp. xii+239. $5.00.

This is the third book in the "Yale Studies in Attitude and Communication" series and the fourth to come out of the Yale Department of Psychology on this general topic. The book shows an increasing awareness of the complex nature of communication in persuasion and continues the program of focusing on one major model of persuasion.

The central theme of the studies here reported is an extension and application to persuasive communication of Festinger's theory of dissonance. Attitudes are postulated as states or conditions of the human organism with three major components: the affective, the cognitive, and the behavioral. When the components are consistent, attitudes and changes are not apt to occur. But when an independent variable produces some modification of one or more of the components the motivation to regain consistency in the total organismic structure may bring about an attitude change. The theory is well documented by citation of studies dealing with each of the components. There is an introductory chapter, four chapters reporting a series of studies, and a chapter of summary and discussion. A Bibliography of relevant studies is provided.

The first study demonstrated that cognitive changes follow changes in feelings and persist after an "affect-revising force is withdrawn." The second study found evidence to show that arguments directed toward an increased consistency modify beliefs in this direction more than arguments designed to decrease consistency. The change is greatest when the connection of the argument with the issues is most evident. Other studies lead the authors to the conclusions that people prefer least effortful paths in solving belief dilemmas; that they seek to maximize potential gain and minimize potential loss; that the consistency influence on attitude change is affected by commitment, and that positive changes in attitude are associated with forces upon us which we have not controlled by choice.

Although these findings can scarcely be considered startling to the traditional theorist or practitioner of persuasive communication, they may well increase the level of confidence with which we discuss or employ the principles involved. Methodological procedures appear to be sound. More data on the measuring instruments used and their reliability and validity would be useful. The style could be clearer in spots as for example (p. 172): "These data support the proposition that, with strength of initial attitude and required discrepant persuasion held constant, the greater the force inducing discrepant persuasion, the less the magnitude of dissonance and consequent attitude change in the direction of the discrepant position."

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER
Ohio State University

STYLE IN LANGUAGE. Edited by Thomas A. Sebeok. New York: The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley & Sons, 1960; pp. xviii+470. $9.50.

The words "style," "language," and "literature" may not be the vaguest words in the English language, but they deserve comparison with any words claiming that distinction. One could predict a high level of confusion for an interdisciplinary conference concerned with these concepts. This prediction is amply fulfilled by the volume *Style in Language*, which reports the proceedings of a 1958 conference held at Indiana University, presumably on the theme of "verbal style and the literary process."

The conference was held under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council as the

sixth in a series of conferences on the study of verbal behavior. It brought together some twenty-six distinguished scholars from such diverse academic areas as literary criticism, psychology, linguistics, and cultural anthropology. *Style in Language* records the texts of nineteen papers presented, and abstracts of six other papers. It further reports the opening and closing statements of six scholars representing the "viewpoints" of linguistics, psychology, and literary criticism, and an edited version of the discussions held by conference participants.

If the design of the conference assured confusion, it also assured a product of remarkable interest and potential importance to all serious students of discourse. Here one finds literary critic I. A. Richards discussing "Poetic Process and Literary Analysis"; folklorist Richard Dorson analyzing "The Oral Styles of American Folk Narrators"; linguist Sol Saporta applying linguistic analysis to the study of poetic language; psychologist John Carroll reporting his use of factor analysis to uncover the dimensions along which prose style is perceived; and psychologist Charles Osgood studying the effects of motivation on the style of encoding through an analysis of suicide notes compared with the letters of persons less emotionally aroused. Here is a variety of studies of language from the perspectives of psychology, semantics, grammar, metrics, phonology, linguistics, and literary theory. The improbability of a conference which would bring together men such as Roman Jakobson, René Wellek, James Jenkins, and George Miller is sufficient to assure a volume meriting the most careful study.

The volume is improbable. The papers manifestly do not represent a range of approaches to any single theme, or even a set of closely related themes. But if the papers taken as a whole represent conceptual chaos, of which the world already has enough, they also represent both individual merit and a remarkable index to the divergent ways in which both casual and non-casual discourse is now being studied in a variety of academic disciplines.

The conference discussions, which seem to have been conducted with considerable candor, make explicit that which is implicit in the papers—the fact that the variety of scholars now studying discourse have no common metalangue, that they use a concept such as "style" in wildly divergent ways, and that they have extraordinary difficulty in either understanding or valuing one another's work.

This volume reflects the reality of the condition of discourse about discourse in American academic circles. And the kind of dialogue represented, tortured and unproductive as it seems, is a necessary first step in the extended dialogue so badly needed among those who study language.

DONALD K. SMITH
University of Minnesota

COURSE IN GENERAL LINGUISTICS. By Ferdinand de Saussure, edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye in collaboration with Albert Reidlinger, translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959; pp. xvi+240. $6.00.

THE HISTORY AND ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE. By A. S. Diamond. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959; pp. 280. $7.50.

A good translation of de Saussure's monumental *Cours* was really long overdue. In this country, it has been more honored in prefaces than by reading, and even the French edition was not always easy to obtain. It is a powerful and durable book. Like the work of Whitney and Bloomfield, it has dated comparatively little and, because of its approach, remains of persistent seminal value.

It is, as well, a tribute to the much-criticized, much-abused lecture system. Despite the flaws bound to ensue when a book is made —after the author's decease—by pooling the notes of his lectures taken over several years, there remains in the text some of the excitement of the lecture: the freedom of exploration, of side glances, of sudden inspirations, even of valuable (because they are) unresolved contradictions. As such, the work in turn reflects an oblique and powerful tribute to this kind of discourse, and the way in which de Saussure dominated it.

So much over so many years has been derived from this book that it were vain in a brief note to try to make a sum. In two respects it proves especially valuable. One, the increasing rapprochement between American and European schools of thought in areas such as dialectology, socio-, psycho-, and ethnolinguistics, and semasiology. The other, the larger rapprochement between inductive and deductive, scientific and humanistic examinations of human speech and communication, in which the field of speech, emerging from torpor and ineffectual traditions, has a critical role to play.

There is surely little fortuity in the way in

which recent detail-studies fill in and confirm the great outlines of Saussurean linguistics. Communication theory is, of course, a beginning toward his *langage*. Saussurean semantics animates much of the European sociology of language, and even general sociological dynamics. Yet precisely because the horizon keeps retreating, we must acknowledge how little Saussure's maps are exhausted, and how much he gives us clues to the waiting *terra incognita*. Professor Baskin's clear translation opens the *Course* to a wider audience, and as it will undoubtedly be widely read and pondered, a service of major importance has been performed.

The History and Origin of Language by A. S. Diamond is extremely well-made, with good binding, handsome printing, excellent paper. Its contents again suggest the wisdom of the moratorium on discussing the origin of language. R. I. P.

WILLIAM KAY ARCHER
University of Illinois

BABY TALK. By Morris Val Jones. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, 1960; pp. xii+96. $4.50.

This book is written for a precisely defined audience, parents of five year old "baby talkers." Many such parents seek answers to certain important questions. Does my child have a speech problem? How serious is it? Where can I find professional help? What can I do at home to help? These are the questions the author sets out to answer. He discusses, in some detail, sources and types of speech correction facilities and offers many helpful suggestions for home cooperation with the professional therapy program. The bulk of the book, however, is devoted to guiding the parents of the child for whom no professional help is available.

A simple articulation test is presented, and a profile of speech behavior characteristic of the fifth year, against which the articulatory proficiency of a specific moppet can be measured. The do-it-yourself parent is given sound advice on how to provide an environment conducive to optimal speech development, on methods for stimulating the child to develop more accurate speech, on how to pin-point possible causal factors, and on ways to eliminate or minimize their influence. The author avoids technical terminology, illumines his main points with a wealth of clinical case material from his own files, and encourages the reader to evaluate objectively both the child and his environment through use of the question-answer technique.

A final chapter deals with speech correction procedures for parents to employ in a home therapy situation. It seems to this reviewer at least that the hazards of this last course of action, for the pedagogically naïve parent-teacher, are heightened by the sketchy treatment of classic articulation therapy, illustrated sparsely with materials confined to the correction of an interdental lisp. Except for references to additional resources, the problems of therapy for other consonant sound misarticulations are not touched upon, and most speech clinicians would agree with the author's own earlier statement that an interdental lisp at five years of age is not ordinarily classified as "baby talk." On the whole, however, the book is carefully written, provides accurate information, and should prove useful to its intended readers.

HELEN G. BURR
University of Virginia

STUTTERING AND WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT IT. By Wendell Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961; pp. xii+208. $3.95.

The first chapter of *Stuttering and What You Can Do About It* is a detailed and captivating account of the experiences of the author. But it is more than an autobiographical sketch. It is the typical story of a stutterer and his family in search of the elusive answer to stuttering. It could be the story of any one of thousands for whom this book was written. The book should do much in easing the burden of their search, and do so in an enjoyable way. The abundance of information on stuttering is presented in simple, clear, and engaging style.

The major portion of the book, chapters two through nine, reports much of the research that has been done on stuttering. This centers on three studies supervised by the author, in which interactions between stutterers and their parents and between parents were investigated. The studies have been previously reported. They were carried out by intensive interviews with the parents of stutterers and with a matched group of parents of children who did not stutter. The data were analysed and comparisons drawn between the two groups of parents. The parents of stutterers who largely overcame their speech prob-

lems are compared with the parents of stutterers who showed little or no improvement. There is not sufficient space here to discuss the findings and interpretations. However, it should be mentioned that they not only are of great value in helping us to understand what causes stuttering, but also do much in refuting several commonly held notions.

The final two chapters of the book deal with what the parents of stutterers can do and what the stutterer himself can do to alleviate the speech problem. The instructions given in these chapters are an application of the knowledge presented in previous chapters.

Some readers may feel that Professor Johnson is too concerned with the first time a listener considers a child's speech to be stuttering. Or they may feel that the author's interpretations place too much emphasis on the effects produced in the young speaker when others are vexed by his speech behavior. To grant these objections would not detract measurably from the value of the book. Its purpose is to give the layman an understanding of the causes of stuttering. The better the layman understands stuttering, the more he can do to prevent it from starting; or if it has already started, the more he can do to keep it from developing; or to deal more effectively with it if it has already developed. The book should prove valuable in achieving these goals. It should satisfy its first two goals particularly well since its content focuses on the very young stutterer.

This work should also prove to be an excellent volume for the person who has an academic interest in stuttering but does not have time to study the more detailed reports of the numerous research projects covered.

EDMUND C. NUTTALL
Cornell University

STUTTERING AND PERSONALITY DYNAMICS: PLAY THERAPY, PROJECTIVE THERAPY, AND COUNSELING. By Albert T. Murphy and Ruth M. FitzSimons. New York: Ronald, 1960; pp. viii+519. $6.50.

Based on their belief that "stuttering speech is a symptom of deep-seated personal difficulties and that it is only by understanding the stutterer" that the problem can be dealt with successfully, the authors present their theory of the nature of stuttering and the related therapy programs. In Part I, a rationale for the author's approach to stuttering is given, followed by a detailed explanation of the theory in Part II. Stuttering is described as "a learned, non-integrative, self-defensive reaction to anxiety or fear of threatening circumstances with which the person feels incapable of coping" (p. 145). The roots of stuttering begin in disturbed interactions with the speaker's parents early during the child's life. The child's inability to integrate competing forces is first experienced as a vague anxiety. Later, the stutterer may come to have specific fears of speaking. Stuttering may become self-perpetuating because of factors such as its role in gaining attention. This "self-process" theory of stuttering is based largely on psychoanalytic theory, although the explanation utilizes principles of learning theory and research findings in the area of speech development and stuttering.

Part III is given to diagnostic and therapeutic techniques. Play therapy and other projective therapy methods are stressed for their release and anxiety reducing properties with young stutterers. Ample illustrative material of clinical sessions are included. A "client-centered counseling" approach is recommended for older stutterers, and for conferences with parents and teachers, although it is apparent that the authors would be more directive than the classical Rogerian counselor. The chapter on diagnosis establishes an excellent framework for the process of evaluating the stutterer but fails to demonstrate specifically enough the actual diagnostic process and application of diagnostic techniques.

This book is an important addition to the field. There is an excellent blend of psychoanalytic concepts with current information on speech development. Processes of therapy are consistent with the theoretical framework, which is more fundamental than many of the current theories of stuttering.

HAROLD L. LUPER
University of Georgia

BROADCASTING AND GOVERNMENT: RESPONSIBILITIES AND REGULATIONS. By Walter B. Emery. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1961; pp. xxiv+482. $7.50.

Few books in the field of broadcasting are as well written as this one. Walter Emery's experiences both as an educator and as a lawyer employed by the Federal Communications Commission have contributed to make this book authoritative, readable, and practical. The broadcast field is treated from its in-

ception through the early days of governmental regulation to the present day. Governmental regulation is treated not only historically, but in a practical manner.

The thorough documentation of this book attests to the fact that the author spent fifteen years in its development. The sections include: Part I. Prologue to Regulation. Part II. The Basis and Scope of Governmental Controls. Part III. Character, Classification and Utilization of Radio Frequencies. Part IV. Problems of Getting on the Air. Part V. The Broadcaster and Ethereal Realities. Part VI. A Look to the Future. Valuable appendices provide pertinent information about field offices of the FCC, FTC guides to advertising, NAB codes, and a bibliography.

Mr. Emery has separated the wheat from the chaff in his discussion of various governmental regulations, how to apply for a license, station operation, copyright, and renewing of licenses. Frequent references are made to the *Federal Register, Radio Regulation* by Pike and Fischer, and FCC *Reports.*

Of particular interest are the chapters dealing with public interest programs and the future of broadcasting. The author points out that the licensee has the "primary responsibility" for determining the nature of its public service programming. The Commission, he says, has not established "any hard and fast formula." Instead, it has "stressed the importance of providing a balanced program service—balanced in the sense that a reasonable effort is made to serve the religious, educational, cultural and economic needs of the community and to afford reasonable access to the microphone or camera for the expression of different points of view on important public issues."

In his concluding chapters, Mr. Emery draws attention to the fact that Congressional investigations of the FCC have lowered its public image to the point of impairing its operation. However, the Legislative Oversight Committee has made some concrete recommendations for Congressional action which the author feels should be carried out. Among the recommendations is one that service fees by the FCC to broadcasters should be increased and that the authority of the FCC over broadcast programming should be clarified.

This book has wide application. The student of broadcasting will learn much about the relationship of American broadcasting to government, and the licensee should welcome such a completely documented reference to broadcast regulation.

HAROLD E. NELSON
The Pennsylvania State University

THE CHURCH IN THE WORLD OF RADIO-TELEVISION. By John W. Bachman. New York: Association Press, 1960; pp. xvii+191. $3.50.

This book is an able treatment of a subject which reaches beyond the mere presentation of the church's messages by means of electronic devices. It is a philosophical treatise which seeks to establish criteria for evaluating the worth of all broadcast activities. Growing out of the author's experience as Professor of Practical Theology at Union Theological Seminary and his place on the National Council's Study Commission on the Role of Radio, Television and Films in Religion, it is an able presentation of the place of the church as it relates to both radio and television transmission and reception.

The book justly condemns both the program producers and operators of the broadcast media for their uncritical continuance of programming without serious effort to research anything further than the actual numbers of people in the listening-viewing audience, or, worse, of those motivational factors which can be commandeered to sell products more effectively.

Criterion for evaluating programming and advertising are presented: "Is the listener-viewer treated as man or less-than-man? . . . is he a man capable of growing and learning, or simply a creature able to react? If he is regarded as a man, he should be aroused and stimulated rather than stupefied; his horizons should be enlarged rather than shrunk. . . ." This series of questions and observations is applied to three areas of broadcasting: advertising, news, and entertainment. The interesting result is that a number of questions are raised for which the reader is invited to provide his own answers.

When Bachman turns to the area of transmission of a religious message, he makes it clear that it is not necessary for the producer of religious programming to adopt all the methods of commercial advertising, but it is essential that he adapt to the medium he is using. He outlines four different purposes which the church may have in broadcasting its message: climate-creation, worship, instruction, and evangelism. He insists that there is

a need for planned diversity instead of haphazard duplication.

The book comes with the endorsement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. It is well-written, and the documentation includes reference to most of the books and articles which have been written on the subject of communicating the Christian message. This book is a significant contribution to broadcasters in general, and more specifically to communicators of religion.

F. Brooks Sanders
Ohio University

THE IMPACT OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION. Edited by Wilbur Schramm. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960; pp. viii+247. $5.00.

TEACH WITH TELEVISION: A GUIDE TO INSTRUCTIONAL TV. By Lawrence F. Costello and George N. Gordon. New York: Hastings House, 1961; pp. 192. $5.50.

The Impact of Educational Television presents thirteen chapters based on studies supported, during the four-year period 1956-59, by research grants-in-aid made by the National Educational Television and Radio Center. The material is organized into four sections: (1) educational television in the community; (2) educational television in the classroom; (3) educational television and children; (4) a proposed theory for the effect of educational television. Most of the studies are reported by the people who did the original research. There is some pulling together of the results of a number of related but independently conducted investigations. Editorial comment is held to a minimum. The studies are described as "scientific inquiries into attitudes, motivations, audience composition, audience size, viewing habits, presentational patterns, attitude change, and learning—all relating to educational television."

The result of this collection of reports is a scholarly reference work providing two extremely useful types of information. First, the book is a source of facts. Second, the book displays the nature of research in the area of educational television: problems, methods, strengths, and weaknesses.

Teach With Television is subtitled, quite properly, a *Guide*. As such, it is highly successful. The book focuses on instructional television, reflecting the extensive experience of the authors and their sensitivity to the need for an overview. The scope of presentation is apparent in the concern with instructional television's nature, limitations, equipment, personnel, lesson planning, production, organization, uses, administration, financing, and evaluation. To develop such scope in a short, easily read presentation, the authors have sacrificed depth. References at the ends of chapters indicate source material available for overcoming this deficiency.

Occasional witticisms add interest but may weaken, for some readers, the sense of the authors' underlying sincerity and sensitivity. More careful editing should have eliminated the few stylistic lapses that constitute distractions in a book by educators for educators. There might be value in a word about the motivational uses of television or the considerable doubt in the minds of many as to the role of feedback facilities. Regardless of specific details, however, the authors have provided a useful guide. Those in need of such a guide will find this one of real value. Those who would prefer the enrichment of an additional hundred pages should remember that they seek an objective different from the authors'.

Martin Cobin
University of Colorado

TELEVISION AND OUR SCHOOLS. By Donald G. Tarbet. New York: Ronald, 1961; pp. x+268. $5.00.

There is a growing interest throughout the United States, especially among the larger school systems, in utilizing television for instructional purposes. The avowed purpose of this book is to help school administrators and teachers who want to develop and present in-school programs via this medium. This purpose is good, and the topics the author purposes to deal with are good: the historical development of instructional television, the various purposes for which schools have used television with examples of each, program planning and production, facilities and equipment, administrative aspects, and educational television's future. The handling of these topics, on the other hand, is less commendable.

This reader failed to find one original thought in the entire book. This, of course, is not unusual and alone might be no cause for rejection of the book. Its other weaknesses are less excusable. Especially annoying are the many bits of simple-minded advice, irrelevant information, errors, naïve acceptance of all

educational television research, and lack of awareness of the present thinking of leaders in the field. A small sample from each of these categories may suffice to show that this is not over-statement.

The reader is advised that "the room may be darkened by turning off the lights and adjusting venetian blinds or shades," that "proper ventilation is very important when large groups meet together for classwork," and that "if written work is required, it should be read and in most instances graded."

The reader is given such irrelevant information (irrelevant for the teacher or administrator who is "interested in developing and presenting programs for in-school viewing") as the band width and frequencies of TV channels. Even more irrelevant is the detailed information about the schedule of a workshop on instructional television in which the author participated.

The errors tend to appear when the author discusses any of the technical aspects of television, such as his confusion of the relationship between open-circuit television and microwave relays, or his statement about programs being presented "by the present Iconoscope system."

Not once is an indication given that most of the research cited in the book was carried out in less than perfect fashion. Not once does the author fulfill the obligation which anyone who writes about research has to assume, at least to some extent, that his readers are given the limitations, as well as the conclusions, of research studies cited.

The major weakness of the book is that it is probably three to five years behind the times. The more astute educational leaders have realized that the major problem is not whether to use television, or how to produce a television course, but rather how to integrate television with all of the other media (including teaching machines) and various kinds of classroom procedures for maximum learning. *Television and Our Schools* will be of little help in dealing with this problem.

SAMUEL L. BECKER
University of Iowa

SPEECH METHODS AND RESOURCES: A TEXTBOOK FOR THE TEACHER OF SPEECH. Edited by Waldo W. Braden. New York: Harper, 1961; pp. viii+568. $6.50.

The primary purpose of this book, written by ten members of the Department of Speech at Louisiana State University, is to give new insights and suggestions to high school and college teachers of general speech courses, especially to inexperienced and future teachers.

The first chapter presents an overview of the speech field and the second delineates the factors which make it a distinct academic area. Despite some overlap in these two essays, they are sensible, informative, and readable. Of particular interest is Professor Gray's account of the development of speech as an academic entity separate from English.

Most of the remaining chapters, although not neatly placed into two categories, may be classified as being concerned with (1) specific areas of speech (with a chapter each on voice and diction, public speaking, discussion and debate, extracurricular forensics, interpretation, dramatics, and radio-tv), or (2) common pedagogical concerns (with a chapter each on teaching of attitudes, teaching content, course planning, delivery, criticism, textbook selection, audio-visual aids, and testing and evaluating). Some of the chapters in the second category, although separate from the one on public speaking, appear to have been written with only public speaking in mind and therefore fail to reveal clearly their applicability to other areas.

However, all chapters are clearly written and educationally sound. Without being dogmatic, the authors wisely supplement generalizations with many concrete and sensible suggestions.

Two chapters, both remarkably well-written, are devoted to helping the classroom teacher understand and help the speech- and hearing-defective student. A final chapter is devoted to concise and accurate descriptions of the various professional organizations.

Attention should be called to the word *resources* in the title. Many chapters contain useful lists of teaching aids and sources of such aids, such as lists of play publishers and films on public speaking. Numerous useful evaluation sheets for various types of speech performances are included. Furthermore, each chapter contains a remarkably thorough bibliography, which should not only lead the inexperienced teacher to new sources but provides a convenient list of references for experienced teachers, including specialists.

In summary, the authors and editor are to be congratulated for having fulfilled well their aim of providing a book useful to beginning teachers of general courses. Indeed, they have

exceeded their aim, for they have written a book from which all speech teachers can obtain useful suggestions.

RONALD F. REID
Purdue University

ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE: RATIONAL DECISION MAKING. By Austin J. Freeley. San Francisco: Wadsworth, 1961; pp. xviii+458. $6.50.

Despite its title, this book by Professor Freeley of John Carroll University in Cleveland is more concerned with debate than with argumentation. For this reason, the text will be more useful to the student specifically interested in intercollegiate debate than to the one who seeks general guidance in reaching decisions by rational means. Professor Freeley consistently espouses the view of "the advocate" (a term which occurs repeatedly), the man who has a position to maintain or oppose. There is less emphasis upon the means of arriving at such positions. Principles for "rational decision making" are stated or implied, but specific applications of them, and most examples, are derived from or related to current practice in intercollegiate debate. For example, by page 20 the student encounters a complete description, together with a full-page tabulation, of the procedures used in selecting the annual national debate topic.

The treatment is comprehensive. It includes the usual sections on definition, analysis, evidence, reasoning, briefing, case construction, refutation, motivation, composition, and delivery. General semantics, brainstorming, evaluation of debate, tournament operation, and parliamentary debate are chapters less frequently found in such a text. Appendices include the Statement of Principles of the American Forensic Association, Rules for the Delta Sigma Rho Student Congress, two intercollegiate debates from the West Point Tournament, the first Kennedy-Nixon debate, a chronological list of national debate topics, and other possible debate propositions.

Some will question the value of "brainstorming" as an educational procedure. The chapter on general semantics, although adequate, is not integrated with other parts of the text. No reference is made to semantic principles, for instance, when methods of definition are discussed. Comparable to most argumentation texts in our field, the chapters on reasoning do not include enough on logic to be clear and useful. For example, the student is given the usual rules regarding distribution of terms in categorical syllogisms, but he is not told how to determine whether or not a term is distributed. He may be unable to determine distribution in such propositions as, "Some Republicans are not conservative" or "Not all Russians are atheists."

On the other hand, the chapters on evidence are especially well done. The treatment of types, uses, and tests of evidence is detailed, functional, and perhaps the best that has appeared in our field. The chapters which relate to the debate case—burdens of proof, alternatives available to each side, methods of attack and defense—are also excellent. In fact, Professor Freeley is at his best when clear exposition of intricate debate problems and technicalities is needed. Those who seek an authoritative statement of debate practice and procedure will find this text most useful.

GORDON F. HOSTETTLER
Temple University

THE SPEAKER'S RESOURCE BOOK: AN ANTHOLOGY, HANDBOOK, AND GLOSSARY. By Carroll C. Arnold, Douglas Ehninger, and John C. Gerber. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1961; pp. 312. Paper $2.75.

AMERICAN ISSUES: A SOURCEBOOK FOR SPEECH TOPICS. By Edwin Black and Harry P. Kerr. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961; pp. 243. Paper $2.25.

IDEAS THAT MATTER: A SOURCEBOOK FOR SPEAKERS. By Lester Thonssen and William L. Finkel. New York: Ronald, 1961; pp. 273. Paper $2.75.

Each of these three books rests upon the premise that the poverty of ideas in student speeches is widespread and constant. Each sets forth a somewhat different solution for this problem. Intensive speech analysis is the cure recommended by one. Timely controversy is the prescription of the second. And a reader's digest of ideas is the remedy suggested by a third.

The Speaker's Resource Book includes five parts: a thought-provoking introduction to modern speech; an anthology of forty-three first rate speeches and essays; a series of sample speech analyses; a succinct handbook on public speaking; and a useful glossary of rhetorical terms. Full texts of speeches are presented. Five of the thirty-nine speeches included here are student efforts, a tacit admis-

sion that even students can achieve excellence. In an otherwise superior text, the one disappointment is that no samples of Irving Lee's "Four Ways of Looking at a Speech" appear.

American Issues is an expansion of Harry Kerr's earlier *Selected Readings on Current Problems*. The stress in this collection is upon currency (only three of the thirty-two selections appeared before 1951) and controversy. At the outset, the authors appear to use the terms "subject," "topic," and "issue" interchangeably. Controversy might have been better served had they placed opposite viewpoints side by side. No distinction is made here between persuasion in speech and persuasion in writing; over one third of the selections included are magazine articles. Six short critiques appear; they might seem more meaty if the emphasis were upon "instructive failures" rather than moderate successes. For example, an analysis of Robert Hutchins' fiery address to the newspaper editors would probably yield more insight into effective persuasion than Clare Booth Luce's subdued wooing of the Women's Press Club.

Ideas That Matter presents 163 "provocative passages" dealing with art, science, education, and public affairs. The authors wish to suggest ideas without supplying full-grown student speeches. A catalogue of ideas with appropriate page references and suggested speech projects appears at the end of the work. Designed as a collateral text, *Ideas That Matter* might better capture student interest if issues, i.e., controversial and timely public questions, replaced abstract ideas.

In summary, the first of these three paperbacks is the most ambitious and the best; it will undoubtedly see several editions. The Black and Kerr book is meant to be timely but temporal; it does represent some improvement in breadth and depth over its predecessor. *Ideas That Matter* will probably last a season, much as the June *Reader's Digest* survives till fall.

GOODWIN F. BERQUIST, JR.
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

INTERPRETATION: WRITER, READER, AUDIENCE. By Wilma H. Grimes and Alethea Smith Mattingly. San Francisco: Wadsworth, 1961; pp. x+358. $5.00.

There is probably little need for another basic text in interpretation unless that text can provide *improved* clarity of accepted principles and *additional* motivation for heightening student participation in analysis and performance. *Interpretation: Writer, Reader, Audience* accomplishes both of these justifications.

Improved clarity of accepted principles can be achieved in a number of ways: clear and concise writing; tight, logical organization; adaptation to current communication concepts; vivid illustration; meaningful integration of parts. Grimes and Mattingly have combined these ways into a text of academic significance without losing sight of their intended readers, students in a basic interpretation course.

Additional motivation for heightening student participation in analysis and performance is, of course, the intent of all authors in the communication arts. Although the authors state that "learning to project vocally and physically the inner responses is the whole burden of this book," it is clear that an assumed prerequisite in this statement is the justification of these inner responses (literary analysis). Grimes and Mattingly join the select few who have accomplished this intent by providing clear and specific methodologies leading to attainable goals. Their provisions for learning, criteria for evaluation, immediate review through capsuled and pertinent summaries—all in harmony with current learning theory—will surely contribute to student perception.

The text is divided into four parts: Part One—three chapters devoted to "the rhetorical, humanistic, and literary basis of interpretation"; Part Two—four chapters devoted to "an application of the techniques of literary analysis to each of four literary modes"; Part Three—two chapters devoted to "a discussion of bodily and vocal skills"; Part Four—three chapters devoted to "the role of the audience, standards for evaluation of interpretation, and principles of programing, with a unique section on the contemporary form known as Readers' Theatre."

Only the "unique section" is disappointing. Here the authors tend to be guilty of oversimplification. Although a series of acceptable statements are made, lacking is the kind of development needed to better guide students in the complex and highly misunderstood form called Readers Theatre.

Realists will do well to ignore the cover of the publisher's brochure announcing this text.

It is not dull, drab and dreary. To the contrary—it is exciting, significant, and sound.

KEITH BROOKS
Ohio State University

BRIEFLY NOTED

ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH TEACHING. By Joseph Mersand. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1961; pp. xii+363. $4.00.

Specialists in all fields complain about education in their specialties, but all specialists and laymen alike seem to lament the teaching of English. Their indictments are impressively listed and summarized and interpreted in this volume dedicated to the sufferings of the 60,000 pedagogues organized in the National Council of Teachers of English.

Questionnaires were addressed to heads of state education departments, college presidents, business executives, members of Congress, magazine editors, managers of bookstores, librarians, deans, publishers, etc., etc. With great care and patience the replies are quoted at length and finally interpreted. The two main conclusions that most impressed me were that teacher requirements in education should be diminished in order to permit an increase of requirements in English, and that almost any layman feels that he could greatly improve on the job that teachers are now doing. There are no references to speech as an allied subject. Here and there occasional observers are quoted who see an improvement in the reading and writing of entering freshmen. I should like to join this minority by recording my admiration for the accomplishments of the freshmen I have known in the past fifteen years. But perhaps this is only a matter of competitive admission.

EVERETT HUNT
Swarthmore College, Emeritus

THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK AND ROMAN THEATER. By Margarete Bieber. (Revised edition.) Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961; pp. xvi+343. $17.50.

The handsome revised and enlarged edition of Margarete Bieber's *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater* tells "the story of the rich development of theatrical life in the different periods and places of the ancient world." The estimable original work has been fortified by judicious use of available new findings in "literary, epigraphical, architectural, and figurative sources." Aspects of physical theater and elements of production are still emphasized; so organization remains the same except that a new concluding chapter entitled, "The Influence of the Ancient Theater on the Modern Theater," has been added. There are other improvements. Continuity of discussion has been improved throughout, and in addition to an expanded chronology and bibliography, 300 illustrations have been added to the visual treasures of the first edition.

This revised edition of Bieber's work, intended to supplant and supplement the edition of 1939, retains the central elements of the original, particularly the precision in scholarship and the quickening quality of exciting search and discovery. Certainly the Princeton University Press, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Ford Foundation should be thanked and congratulated for publishing this superb new edition of a significant contribution to study in the humanities.

DAVID S. HAWES
Indiana University

BENJAMIN HARRISON, HOOSIER WARRIOR: THROUGH THE CIVIL WAR YEARS, 1833-1865. By Harry J. Sievers, S.J. (Revised edition.) New York: University Publishers, 1960; pp. xxx+374. $6.00.

This is a revision of Volume I in the projected three volume biography of Benjamin Harrison. The first edition of Volume I appeared in 1952. Volume II was published in 1959. Volume III is now in preparation.

Why a revision of Volume I before Volume III is published? Presumably to exploit current interest in the Civil War. The revision consists of an expanded preface detailing the long search for a Harrison biographer and an additional 30 pages of Index. Pages 1 through 331 are apparently run from the original plates without change.

VICTOR M. POWELL
Wabash College

SHOP TALK

ROBERT L. SCOTT, *Editor*

ON STUDYING ABROAD—NOTE FROM LONDON

Loren Reid

Occasionally during my year here in London I have received letters from teachers who want to pursue an advanced study project overseas, inquiring about places to study and possible topics. Here are a few paragraphs about the facilities of the British Museum, with added words about other collections.

Somewhere I have read that the British Museum Library houses 11,000,000 items, including four million manuscript items. Still more impressive, however, is the quality of its material. I have been able to see, for example, forty-two volumes of Fox letters and other papers, and still have 40,000 as-yet-uncatalogued items of Holland House papers to see on a later visit. I have also seen more or less complete files of six to ten different London newspapers for the forty years between 1768 and 1808. Any one who has consulted the Union List of Serials knows how difficult it is to see London newspapers in any quantity in the United States—though the situation is getting better. The B.M. has also twenty volumes of Aberdeen papers, ten of John Bright, thirty of Richard Cobden plus his American diaries, 760 of Gladstone, two of Spencer Perceval plus drafts of speeches, 280 of Balfour including some speeches and notes, 175 of Palmerston, 437 of Peel, others on Flood, Russell, Campbell-Bannerman, *et al.*

Theatre and literature people would be intrigued by items like Add. Mss. 42720, "Letters and papers of R. B. Sheridan relating to Drury Lane and Lyceum theatres"; sixty-five volumes of W. S. Gilbert with drafts and synopses of plays and libretti, costume plates, production details, and the like; two volumes of Thomas King; diaries and sketchbooks of Thackery; correspondence of Leigh Hunt; works and letters of Robert Southey; and so on.

Moreover, an impressive collection is housed in the Bodleian. (On arriving in Oxford, I asked the waitress at the restaurant, "Where is the Bodleian?" and she replied, "I don't know, Sir, I'm quite new here, and don't know the inns"—but when I explained that the Bodleian was not an inn, she promptly dug up the information for me.) The Bodleian now has the Chapman index—a helpful guide to articles published in British historical journals. Disraeli papers are at Hughenden Manor, a few miles west of London; the new book, *The Young Disraeli,* was written from these materials. Burke papers are at Sheffield, and can be made available through prior application; three volumes of Burke have already been published, and the fourth is at the printer's. The Public Record Office in London is the British

Mr. Reid, Professor of Speech, University of Missouri, was executive secretary of SAA from 1945-1951, and was president in 1957. He was the first editor of Shop Talk and served 1954-56. Since he spent the year 1960-61 in London, teaching in the Overseas Division of the University of Maryland, and researching in the field of British public address, we asked him to send us a London dispatch.

equivalent of our National Archives Building. Special collections are also maintained at the Guildhall and the Inns of Court.

The collection at Trinity College, Dublin, has value for those interested in Irish oratory and drama; here again one could compile such a list of persons and movements to investigate that I have often wondered why more of our researchers have not consulted the Dublin sources. In the opposite direction from London is the Bibliothèque Nationale; once the researcher has secured a note from the cultural attaché of the American embassy in Paris, he can secure a card as a *lecteur* and read away to his heart's content. I received all sorts of help from the B.N. staff, in the manuscripts room and elsewhere, in running down queries on Fox and Pitt.

To secure permits and admission cards, simply bring along an identifying letter from your president or dean—some one who can be looked up, if necessary, in standard references like *Who's Who in America*. Other than that, there is little red tape. Often it helps to write, explaining the purpose of your visit; you can be mailed an application form, and thus some of the paper work can be done ahead of time.

Working with original sources, as every one knows, is stimulating—not that they change one's basic views so much as they sharpen and enrich his grasp of person, place, and time. Chatham's last speech in the House of Lords (black suit, collapse at the finish) seems, viewed through newspaper accounts and other sources, more pitiful than dramatic. Burke was undeniably and frequently tedious ("How long, Sir, has Mr. Burke been speaking?" "I don't exactly know, but I should suppose about a lunar month"), but he also commanded respect, some of it extravagant ("Where his opinion has been got, it is in vain to look for a better"). Fox had more humor in his system than Goodrich or any one else credits him with ("Mr. Fox compared his debts with those of the Government, and set the House in a roar"); and so it goes.

The stream of sidelights is endless. Since each researcher and each generation ask different questions of the sources, I will always recall that in the space-age summer of 1961 I read with fascination about the balloon craze that hit London in 1783 and 1784. Signor Lunardi, for instance, came to the city and filled a vast, canvas balloon with inflammable air; hundreds of distinguished people, among them Fox, Burke, Pitt, Sheridan, North, gathered to watch the ascension. They saw the Signor rise slowly, and at first awkwardly, above the ground; then, gaining height and momentum, swing to the west above St. Paul's, getting farther away and higher until he was "no larger than a tennis ball," and finally vanishing completely. Days passed with no word from the gallant and intrepid aerial navigator; when he did get back to London he commanded all the attention and admiration that Major Gagarin did this 1961 summer. As people looked at Lunardi, they could reflect that here was a human being who had traversed the awful distance of seventy miles in the air, at times four miles high, and who was still able to view his colossal achievement "with philosophic calm." Balloon ascensions then became commonplace. Balloon themes were the rage: balloon hats, balloon jokes, balloon songs. The Prince of Wales attended a ball wearing balloon silk. A newspaper ran a feature column under the heading, "Aerostatic Intelligence." And in a meeting at Newmarket, Charles James Fox entered a racing colt called "Balloon."

We have had several visitors this year: Mary Graham of Brooklyn, Jerome

Landfield of Oberlin, Owen Peterson of L.S.U. Many, many others from the States have read and browsed here. All of us are grateful to our overseas hosts for the courtesies that have been extended to us.

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

National

Speech Association of America: Statler Hilton, New York, December 27-30; (1962, Cleveland; 1963 [August], Denver; 1964, Chicago).

American Educational Theatre Association: University of Oregon, August 20-22; (1963, University of Minnesota, August 25-27; 1964, University of Pittsburgh, August 27-29).

American Speech and Hearing Association: Sherman, Chicago, November 5-8.

National Society for the Study of Communication: with SAA in New York.

NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: with SAA in New York.

Regional

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 12-14.

Western States: Fresno State College, November 23-25.

New England States: Eastern Slope Inn, North Conway, New Hampshire, November 24-25.

Southern States: Hotel Driskill, Austin, Texas, April 5-6 (High School and College Forensic Meet and Student Congress, April 1-6).

Central States: Hotel Sherman, Chicago, April 6-7; (1963, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, April 5-6).

Related Organization

National Council of Teachers of English: Bellevue Stratford, Philadelphia, November 23-25.

NEW TABLE OF CONTENTS. Copies of the new *Table of Contents* and *Revised Index* for *QJS, SM,* and *ST* were mailed to members in August. The volume was compiled by Franklin H. Knower as usual, and has eighty-six pages. The listings are complete for each journal from its first issue through 1960. Copies sell for $1.25 and can be procured from Robert C. Jeffrey, Executive Secretary, SAA, Indiana University, Bloomington.

NEW MAGAZINE. The National Council of Teachers of English is issuing a new magazine, *Studies in the Mass Media,* designed for the use of students and teachers. Information about the periodical, published monthly October through May (October 1960, Volume I, Number 1), may be obtained from the editorial offices, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. "The subscription is only $2.00 a year and all the back issues are still in print," writes the editor, Joseph Mersand, Jamaica High School, New York City.

NEA PLACEMENT SERVICE. The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association proposes to announce during the present year through the columns of the *Journal of Teacher Education,* "in a highly ethical and confidential manner, (1) openings in teacher-education institutions and (2) the availability of personnel for employment in teacher-education institutions." Anyone wishing to make use of the service may write to *Journal of Teacher Education,* NEA, 1201-16th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., enclosing a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

NEW DEPARTMENT. A new Department of Dramatic Art and Speech was established on the Davis, California, campus of the University of California on July 1. The department was formed by division of the previous Department of English, Dramatic Art and Speech. Theodore J. Shank will serve as chairman of the department, which "offers a major in Dramatic Art and Speech, conceived as a strong liberal education as well as a teaching major for secondary credential candidates and a scholarly preparation for graduate work. . . . The department expects to offer graduate degrees before many years."

Conventions

CENTRAL STATES. Some people perennially tote up the batting averages of ball players or quote world records to 1840 for the mile run; others tabulate convention attendance figures. The most frequently asked question at the Central States Speech Association Annual Conference in the La Salle Hotel, April 14-15, Chicago, was, "How is registration coming?" From this person's vantage point the answer

was, "Very efficiently." The final figure turned out to be 461, with a somewhat smaller than expected registration on Saturday, perhaps due to a forecast of snow in the Chicago area. The over-all attendance was down from 527 in Chicago one year ago but up from about 400 in Detroit two years ago. In addition, for the record keepers, memberships in CSSA are at an all-time high, with a gain of about 175 during the past year.

CSSA President, Charlotte Wells, planned, according to all comment, an excellent program including thirty-three sectional meetings on all topics from "Integrating the Arts" to "Automated Teaching Procedures." Particularly strong were the programs in Speech and Hearing. Frances McCurdy and CSSA vice president G. Bradford Barber, climaxed the Friday morning general session with an impressive but restrained dialogue in presenting awards to eleven outstanding young teachers.

Earlier the session had been addressed by historian and educationist-hunter Arthur Bestor of the University of Illinois on the debate over slavery in the territories. Friday afternoon President Wells cut through parliamentary information and misinformation to preside handily over a business meeting marked by debate and substantive resolutions. President-Elect Henry L. Ewbank, Jr. talked of "Plans and Platitudes" in a noteworthy address which ran no longer than planned.

As in 1960, the La Salle Hotel proved excellent except for the cramped mezzanine. SAA and Robert Jeffrey gave assistance with placement affairs. A suite, removed from the cramped mezzanine, had position and applicant listings, convenient interviewing accommodations, and personnel to assist in arranging interviews and in joining SAA's Placement Service.

Officers as of July 1 will be: president, H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Purdue University; president-elect, G. Bradford Barber, Illinois Normal University; vice president, Raymond Smith, Indiana University; executive secretary, alas, Merrill T. Baker, University of South Dakota, until July 1963. Robert Goyer of Purdue University begins a three-year term as editor of the *Central States Speech Journal* with the Fall 1961 issue.

MERRILL T. BAKER
University of South Dakota

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION. The convention met at the Hotel Everglades, Miami, Florida, April 6-7. Several joint sessions were held with the South Eastern Theatre Conference which met at the same time, same place. President Joseph Wetherby of SSA, speaking on "Academic Status Seekers," and Delmar Solem, president of the South Eastern Theatre Conference, speaking on "The Riddle of the Sphinx," addressed the opening session.

Even before their elders were underway, high school and college students from throughout the south met in the annual Southern Forensic Tournament and Student Congress.

There were enough business meetings and sectional meetings to satisfy the most hardy convention-goer. Especially interesting was the meeting at the second general session. Representing SETC, Arthur H. Dorlag, Florida State University, spoke on "Theatre vs. Speech"; speaking for SAA, Waldo Braden, Louisiana State University, spoke on "The Place of Speech and Drama in the Curriculum." ST's southern spies inform him that Mr. Dorlag argued that speech and drama are better off working in combination because (1) "you have more than one kind of money"; and (2) students are more fully prepared. Mr. Braden called attention to the fact that James Conant fails to mention speech or drama as worthwhile high school or college subjects and maintained that "science may swallow us if we do not fight for our area of specialization and convince people that no man can be thought educated who cannot communicate his ideas clearly and effectively."

Officers of SSA for the current year are: president, William S. Smith, Auburn University; first vice president, C. Cordelia Brong, Louisiana State University; second vice president, Loretta G. Brown, Anniston Public Schools, Anniston, Alabama; third vice president, Helen G. Thornton, Mercer University; third vice president elect, Robert B. Capel, Stephen F. Austin State College; and executive secretary, L. L. Zimmerman, University of Florida. With the declaration that the Thirty-second Convention will be held April 5-6, 1962, at the Hotel Driskill, Austin, Texas, the southerners adjourned, revelling in the fact that Mayor Robert King High of Miami had officially declared the week of April 3-7, 1961, as "Speech and Drama Week."

NCTE. SAA and AETA are sponsoring a program at The National Council of Teachers of English fifty-first annual convention in Philadelphia (see Shop Talk Calendar), on "Speech and the Theatre Arts." Donald K. Smith, University of Minnesota, will represent SAA. Hubert C. Heffner, Indiana University, will represent AETA. The program is scheduled for three o'clock, Friday, November 24.

Summer Visitors

Joseph F. Smith, University of Hawaii, was visiting professor at the Banff School of Fine Arts, Banff, Alberta.

James Popovich, University of Georgia, and Robert L. Smith, Hope College, taught at Bowling Green State University.

At Brigham Young University, Mordecai Gorelik, a veteran Broadway and Hollywood director and designer, now research professor in theatre at Southern Illinois University, directed *The Dybbuk*. According to a program note, S. Ansky's play is "still the most popular item in the repertory of the Habima, which is now the national theatre of Israel."

Ned Bowler, University of Colorado, taught at Long Beach State College.

Michael McHale, University of Pittsburgh, visited Fairmont (West Virginia) College where he directed *Picnic*.

A special program in public speaking and public reading at Principia College was directed by Patrick Welch, University of Houston.

Henry Youngerman, State University of New York College of Education, Fredonia, was a visiting professor at Los Angeles State College, and Robert Douglass of Los Angeles State taught at Fredonia. S. J. Rosica, St. Mary's School for the Deaf, Buffalo, served as director of the Fredonia Speech and Hearing Clinic for the summer.

Virginia Puich, University of Colorado, taught at Stanford University.

Visitors at Syracuse University were Thorrel Fest, University of Colorado; David Kendall, University of British Columbia; and J. J. Thompson, Long Beach State College.

A special program in speech and voice therapy at Tufts University was under the direction of Gertrud Lasch Wyatt, school psychologist and director of speech therapy, Wellesley, Massachusetts, Public Schools.

Visitors at the University of Colorado were Virgil Anderson, Stanford University; Rex Robinson, Utah State University; Charles D. Smith, Syracuse University; Charlotte Wells, University of Missouri; Marian Milstead, Cheyenne, Wyoming, Public Schools; and Ernest Pech, Denver Public Schools.

Stanley Ainsworth, University of Georgia, and Paul Hunsinger, Occidental College, taught at the University of Denver.

Eloise Kennedy, elementary supervisor at the New Mexico School for the Deaf, was guest instructor at the University of Nebraska in a special course in language training for the deaf.

Special courses in audiology were offered at the University of the Pacific by Maurice H. Miller, director of the Hearing and Speech Clinic at Kings County Hospital Center, New York City.

Merle Ansberry, University of Hawaii, taught at the University of Southern California.

Courses in experimental phonetics and speech research methods were offered at the Cleveland Speech and Hearing Center of Western Reserve University by William Tiffany, University of Washington.

Donald K. Smith, University of Minnesota, offered seminars in speech education and the psychology of speech at the University of Wisconsin.

Summer Workshops and Institutes

Adelphi College (Garden City, New York) held its first Summer Television Workshop from July 5 to August 16 at WQED-TV, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Although WQED supplied staff and facilities for seminars, demonstrations, and program preparation and operation, the workshop was under the direction of Adelphi's Donald J. Canty. On its own campus, the college offered a workshop in speech and hearing rehabilitation; Leola S. Horowitz directed the program.

Baylor University's High School Speech Institute and Teachers Workshop attracted fifty-two students this year for the two week session.

Carnegie Tech established a program for high school students this summer working in conjunction with The Harmonie Associate's production of *Man's Reach*, a historical drama held out-of-doors at Old Economy, Ambridge, Pennsylvania.

Catholic University of America sponsored a Workshop on Speech and Language Therapy with the Brain-Damaged Child, June 16-27. The participants visited clinical facilities in the Washington, D. C. area, and in addition

to regular classes, attended lectures by medical and psychological specialists. William T. Daley was in charge of the program.

Chico State College, in cooperation with the Chico Recreation District, sponsored a six-week Young People's Theatre Workshop which enrolled 134 students ranging from five to nineteen years of age. Five one-act plays and a three-act play were performed publicly. In cooperation with the Butte County Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the college operated a Special Services Center for remedial speech work. One hundred ten children participated.

Humboldt State College conducted its first radio-television workshop under the direction of Dale Anderson this year.

Thirty-nine students gathered at Illinois State Normal University for the first Summer High School Institute, July 9-29. Students chose work in either forensics or drama.

Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, offered its Second Annual High School Debate Coaches Institute this summer. Richard A. Hildreth supervised the program of seminars and research.

Kent State University sponsored its Twenty-sixth Annual High School Speech Institute. Thirty high school sophomores and juniors participated in radio-television speaking, discussion and debate, public speaking, interpretation, and theatre. The workshop was climaxed by a campus theatrical performance and a debate televised on WEWS-TV, Cleveland.

"Creative Expression for Children and Youth" was the title of a workshop in drama, interpretation, and speech at Occidental College under Norman Freestone, John Ingle, and Leo Buscaglia.

Two complementary workshops were conducted at Purdue, June 27 through July 15. High school drama students "were given intensive training in voice, diction, body movement, fencing, makeup, acting, and stagecraft." They also produced the children's play, *Rumpelstiltskin*. At the same time, high school teachers participated in a workshop emphasizing play selection, techniques of direction, and stage settings and lighting.

A Summer Studio Theatre was conducted at St. Louis University by John I. C. Foreman with a group of fourteen high school students who were awarded scholarships on a competitive basis. Two productions climaxed the summer school experiment.

Texas College of Arts and Industries offered its Sixth Annual Drama Workshop for high school teachers in the south Texas area, June 6-23. Twenty Kingsville junior and senior high school students participated during the final week as actors in scenes directed by the workshop members.

Texas Technological College conducted an European Theatre Tour, June 1 to July 10. Twenty-two productions were seen in England, Scotland, Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, and France. The tour is offered with six hours of credit in European Theatre every three years as part of a cycle of travel courses which includes a tour of theatres in the eastern part of the United States and Canada (1962) and a tour of theatres in the western states and Canada. A workshop in high school speech activities was given July 15 to August 5. High school teachers and students participated in one-act plays, debate, persuasive speaking, and oral interpretation.

Fifty-eight students attended the High School Institute for Speech at the University of Colorado, June 26 to July 21. Students selected class and laboratory work in forensics or dramatics. Barbara Schindler was the institute director.

The Ninth Annual Speech Roundup was held at the University of Houston under the direction of Donald Streeter. Sixty students from three states participated in one-act plays, duet acting, radio-television speaking, oral interpretation, debate, and persuasive speaking. A teachers workshop was conducted during the Roundup.

The Thirtieth Annual Workshop in Discussion and Debate under the direction of seven high school teachers, supervised by Todd G. Willy, was held at the University of Iowa. Another workshop, in radio and television, was supervised by H. Clay Harshbarger. A third workshop, the Thirtieth Annual Workshop in Dramatic Art, presented five plays under the direction of high school teachers supervised by Philip Benson. All of these workshops served as laboratories for twenty-four teachers from seven states enrolled in the annual Workshop in Teaching Speech and Dramatic Art conducted by Hugh F. Seabury. One hundred forty high school students participated.

The University of Kansas sponsored its annual High School Speech and Drama Institute for high school students under the direction of the departmental staff. Courses and work-

shop sessions were conducted in debate, oral interpretation, public speaking, and drama.

The University of Minnesota held two workshops for high school students, June 12 to July 14. The workshop in drama, climaxed by a production of *The Skin of Our Teeth,* was directed by Arthur Ballet. Sir Tyrone Guthrie visited for a week of daily lectures. George Shapiro directed the forensics workshop.

A four week workshop, the Fifth Annual Western Forensic Institute for Superior High School Students, was under the direction of James H. McBath at the University of Southern California.

Fifty-nine high school students from eleven states and Canada participated in the dramatic and forensic activities of the University of Wisconsin High School Speech Institute, June 26 to July 15. Thomas Murray served as director of the institute.

Sundry Conferences and Lectures

A hearing workshop for speech therapists from southwestern Pennsylvania was conducted April 13 at California State College under the direction of Andy E. Fabian and Annette Kaleita. Speakers were L. Deno Reed, Pennsylvania Department of Health; Maude O. Brungard, supervisor of public instruction; and Rebecca Marriner, Western Pennsylvania School for the Deaf.

A symposium "On the Brain Injured Child" was presented July 6 and 7 at the Jersey City State College under the direction of Marion Cass Tripp. Twenty specialists in medicine, psychology, special education, and speech therapy were featured.

Elise Hahn, University of California, Los Angeles, presented a series of eight lectures for the Twenty-Seventh Annual Conference on Speech Education sponsored by Louisiana State University, June 13-22.

A special program, "An Evaluation of Oral Communication in the Modern World," was presented by the staff of the speech department at St. Louis University. Charles P. Peterson served as chairman for the program.

Richard M. Weaver, University of Chicago, will deliver a public lecture, "The Cultural Role of Rhetoric," at the University of Arkansas in November.

The University of Chicago sponsored a conference, "Dialog: The American Theatre Today," August 4-6. Included on the program were Harold Clurman, William Inge, Basil Rathbone, Kenneth Burke, Reuel Denny, and Charles Kligerman.

Lecturers at the University of Denver's Basic Communication Workshop this summer were William Pemberton, communication consultant, San Francisco; Allen Walker Read, English Department, Columbia University; Dominick A. Barbara, Karen Horney Clinic, New York; and Jon Eisenson, Queens College.

James H. McBath, University of Southern California, was the guest lecturer at the annual University of Hawaii speech workshop in June.

Over two hundred people attended the annual Summer Speech Conference at the University of Michigan, July 13. Speakers included John Gassner, Yale University; Ralph Nichols, University of Minnesota; Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne State University; Lionel Crocker, Denison University; Charlotte Lee, Northwestern University; Mary Rose Costello, Henry Ford Hospital; Herbert J. Oyer, Michigan State University; Harold O. Haskitt, Jr., General Motors Institute; Martin G. Atkins and Emil R. Pfister, Central Michigan University; William Work, Eastern Michigan University; Robert Paul Dye, Western Michigan University; Edward Stasheff, University of Michigan.

A series of seminar-lectures at the University of Pittsburgh this past year has included Bernard Mayo, University of Birmingham, England; Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State University; Kalman A. Burnim, Tufts University; Maurice Natanson, University of North Carolina; David Fellman, University of Wisconsin; Samuel L. Becker, University of Iowa; Wilbur Samuel Howell, Princeton University; Walther Unruh, Technical University of Berlin.

The University of Washington featured three short conferences this summer: "The Role of the Classroom Teacher in Speech Correction," directed by Kathleen Pendergast; "Readers Theatre Techniques," lead by Wilma H. Grimes; and "Directing Forensics," conducted by David Strother. A conference on "Teaching Speaking and Listening" was held in September under the direction of Oliver W. Nelson.

The University of Wisconsin held its annual Speech Conference on June 29. Speakers were Donald K. Smith, University of Minnesota; Andrew T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin; Barbara Schindler, University of Colorado; Wallace Smith, Evanston, Illinois, Township High School; Eugene Cramer, Lincoln High School, Minotowoc, Wisconsin; and Arnold

Melzer, Sheboygan, Wisconsin, South High School. In addition to the faculty of the department, the staff for the annual Wisconsin Idea Theatre was augmented by visiting lecturers: Richard Hoover, general manager of the Pittsburgh Playhouse; Jules Irving, San Francisco State College; Eric Salmon, British theatrical producer; John Wray Young and Margaret Mary Young, Shreveport, Louisiana, Little Theatre.

Raymond S. Ross, Wayne State University, coordinated a special program for psychiatric residents at Wayne State Hospital on "Communicalogy." Wayne State faculty members participating in the summer program were D. Lloyd, English; F. E. Brammer, Electrical Engineering; J. Gaeth, speech and hearing clinic; C. M. Solley, psychology; J. C. Sullivan, educational psychology; and Rupert Cortright, speech.

In May, John B. Kuiper, University of Iowa, spoke on "Film as a Contemporary Art Form" at Western Illinois University.

THE GREAT DEBATES. A book on the Nixon-Kennedy debates, "to which leading figures in the television industry and the communications field are contributing," will be published under the title *The Great Debates* late this fall by the Indiana University Press. Among the contributors are SAA members Samuel L. Becker, University of Iowa, and Raymond Smith, Indiana University. Sidney Kraus of Indiana University's Radio-Television Department is editor of the volume.

COLLEGE QUESTIONS: The SAA Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate has announced the national questions for 1961-62.

The debate proposition is, Resolved: That labor organizations should be under the jurisdiction of anti-trust legislation.

The discussion question is: What procedures should the Federal Government follow to protect the civil rights of all citizens?

The high school questions for 1961-62 were reported in the April issue (XLVII, 226).

INTERNATIONAL DEBATE. The meeting to select debaters to tour Britain this winter and spring was held at Sheraton Towers, Chicago, May 14-15. Nine debaters selected in regional screenings were invited to the meeting, but only seven were able to make the trip. The conclave was directed by Miss Judith Sayers, Institute of International Education, and Franklin R. Shirley, Wake Forest College, chairman of the SAA Committee on International Discussion and Debate. Also serving on the board of judges were: Mary Louise Gehring, Stetson University; Martin J. Holcomb, Augustana College; James H. McBath, University of Southern California; Glen E. Mills, Northwestern University; Richard Murphy, University of Illinois.

The selection included interviews, after-dinner speaking, and a parliamentary debate on "This House prefers Rocking Chairs to Rockets." The debaters split four to three for the proposition, but the judges, in a courtesy ballot, went solidly for the rockers.

Selected for the tour are Joseph G. Cook, University of Alabama and Richard D. Kirshberg, Northwestern University. Alternates are Richard J. Smith, Augustana College and Allen R. Rule, Ohio State University.

TAPED DISCUSSION CONTEST. The deadline for entries for the Eleventh Annual National Contest in Public Discussion is November 15. The tape recorded discussions should be sent to Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois Undergraduate Division, Navy Pier, Chicago 11, Illinois.

A GUEST ON FORENSICS

We are grateful to ST for permitting us to talk shop in Shop Talk instead of merely agreeing to talk about us. Such a privilege must not be abused by embarrassing our host with a polemic, for instance, against hardware forensics, or with a longish description of the conception, birth, growth and maturation of a special speech activity brain child. ST's readers are nearly all spiritual gourmets and have come to expect only succulent tidbits of news.

When one abandons competitive forensics, it is important to find a substitute for a statue (clothed or naked) that will motivate students to speak in public with aplomb if not with eloquence. Discussions, town meetings, or even speakers' bureaus tend to be regarded as second best or possibly as a bit "lower-upper." Community service speaking, in our experience, appears to meet the challenges, however.

Each semester we attach ourselves to some worthy local organization in need of improved public relations with the community. We confer with its officers, become familiar with its operations, study its needs and then prepare talks on its behalf before community groups or over radio and TV facilities. Frequently

our audio-visual service prepares colored slides to aid (but not to replace) our speakers. The speech outline, of course, must be adaptable to the nature of the audience and to time limits. To date we have worked happily with The Good Will Industries, The Family Service Association, The League of Women Voters, and a State Mental Institution. Next fall we intend to work with the County Jail Rehabilitation Organization.

Students of interpretation or from story telling classes have their places in this program, too. They look forward to trips to hospitals, including the Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children, where they use their ingenuity to entertain and cheer the bedridden. These experiences are self rewarding.

LAWRENCE H. MOUAT
San Jose State College

APPOINTMENTS

American University: Michael M. Osborn, Jerome B. Polisky, assistant professors.

Auburn University: Paul Mattox.

Bowdoin College: Charles R. Petrie.

Bowling Green State University: Otto F. Bauer, Charles R. Boughton, R. Franklin Smith, and Lael J. Woodbury.

Bradley University: John Schmidt, instructor.

Brooklyn College: Robert Williams.

Carnegie Tech: Robert Corrigan, Andrew Mellon Visiting Professor of Drama; Theodore Hoffman, professor; Dan Snyder, Kathleen Stafford, assistant professors.

Central Michigan University: Eugene E. Rydahl, assistant professor.

Clarion College: Jerome Liebman, assistant professor.

Columbia University, Teachers College: Edward D. Mysak, professor; Eleanor Morrison, F. Fulton Ross, instructors.

Cornell University: Gerald J. Canter, assistant professor; Marvin A. Carlson, instructor.

Defiance College: John Gore.

Delta College: Joan Hackett.

DePauw University: J. Alan Hammack, associate professor and chairman of the department.

East Tennessee State College: John B. Ellery.

Hamline University: James Connolly, assistant professor and acting department chairman.

Humboldt State College: Raymond G. Fong, assistant professor; Howard I. Streifford, instructor.

Illinois State Normal University: Harry E. Stiver, Jr., associate professor; Robert Lupella, assistant professor; Ivonne Bronowicz, instructor.

Iowa State Teachers College: Robert J. Wesley.

Kent State University: Rella King, Larry Terango, Richard C. Wickman, instructors.

King's College: William Wolak, instructor.

Louisiana State University: Marla D. Wright, instructor.

Mankato State College: H. Jane Peterson.

Memphis State University: Floyd R. Herzog.

North Dakota State University: Marvin Hanson.

Northern Michigan College: John Monsma.

Northwestern University: Tom E. Tillman, Harold J. Todd, assistant professors; and Lilla A. Heston, Emanuel J. Kerikas, Chester C. Lang, instructors.

Occidental College: Sally Osborne Norton.

Ohio University: Edwin L. Glick, instructor.

Paterson State College: Celia Heller, Anthony Maltese, assistant professors.

Purdue University: Peter H. Blake, David J. Mall, Calvin N. Smith, Charles J. Stewart, Donald R. Treat, instructors.

Queens College: Gary Gumpert.

St. Cloud State College: Charles E. Howard, James N. Pitzer, instructors.

Southeastern Louisiana College: Randall Buchanan, instructor.

Southern Connecticut State University: Robert C. Cowles.

State University of New York College of Education, Fredonia: Elliott Zinner, instructor.

Temple University: Don S. Sundquist.

Texas College of Arts and Industries: Josephone B. Moran, assistant professor.

Texas Technological College: June Bearden, Charles Buzzard, and Robert C. Dick.

University of Arkansas: Don D. Bersinger, assistant professor.

University of Arizona: Eldon E. Baker.

University of California, Davis: Alan A. Stambusky, assistant professor; Benne B. Daniel, instructor.

University of Colorado: Martin Cobin, associate professor; Lois Bursack, Charles McNames, instructors.

University of Denver: William Breckwoldt, visiting associate professor; Alvin A. Goldberg, assistant professor.

University of Hawaii: Perry E. Baisler, visiting professor; Sara Ann Burgess, Wayne H. Oxford, John H. Sloan, instructors.

University of Houston: Eric E. Sinkkonen.

University of Iowa: Douglas Ehninger, pro-

fessor; Howard Stein, Todd G. Willy, John H. Terfloth, instructors.

University of Kansas: Richard L. Johannesen, instructor.

University of Maryland: Carl H. Weaver, associate professor; George Brenholtz, Harold Copeland, instructors. In the overseas division: Donald P. Garner, Kenneth Lyman, John Robson, Jack C. Swart, Richard Willis to Europe; Thomas Killough, Richard Orr, Lewis H. Swan to the Far East.

University of Michigan: Robert C. Schnitzer, professor and executive director of the theatre; Kenneth Anderson, instructor; LeVern Stillwell, lecturer.

University of Minnesota: Gerald Siegel, associate professor.

University of Minnesota, Duluth: Robert Spanabel.

University of Mississippi: Raymond W. Tyson.

University of Missouri: Barry J. Cronin, Dianne C. Ellis, Larry Hutchins, Luke F. Lamb, Donald W. MacLennan.

University of Nebraska: William Morgan, director of theatre; Clifford Ashby, assistant professor; Doris Davis, instructor.

University of North Dakota: Mitchell R. Burkowsky, assistant professor; David E. Beach, James W. Woolsey, instructors.

University of Pittsburgh: Edwin Black, assistant professor; Philip Eck, Bernard Engel, instructors.

University of Washington: LuVern Kunze, Gerald Miller, assistant professors; Robert G. Smith, instructor.

University of Wisconsin: Lloyd F. Bitzer, Lowell L. Manfull, Joseph M. Ripley, assistant professors.

Wartburg College: John Gill, John Ness.

Wayne State University: Gary Witt, instructor.

Western Michigan University: Ronald H. Denison.

Wisconsin State College, River Falls: Bernard J. Skalka.

Promotions

American University: Roger Penn, assistant professor; Robert M. Henderson, director of theatre.

Baylor University: Cecil May Burke, professor; Mary A. Booras, assistant professor.

Bowling Green State University: George Herman, Melvin Hyman, Frank L. Miesle, Raymond Yeager, associate professors.

Chico State College: Allan E. Forbes, professor; David Morgan, associate professor; and Ann Becker, assistant professor.

Humboldt State College: John F. Pauley, professor; Dale N. Anderson, Edward D. Steele, W. L. Turner, associate professors; Leah D. Grigsby, assistant professor.

Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia: Karl C. Brider, department chairman.

Kent State University: William H. Zucchero, assistant professor.

Lamar State College: Arnold C. Anderson, associate professor; George E. Bogusch, assistant professor.

Louisiana State University: George Gunn, associate professor.

Northwestern University: Franklyn S. Haiman, Charlotte Lee, professors; Jack C. Ellis, David R. Rutherford, associate professors.

Ohio University: Edward M. Penson, Lloyd I. Watkins, associate professors.

Purdue University: W. Charles Redding, professor; Robert S. Goyer, Ronald F. Reid, John T. Rickey, associate professors; Roger C. Hill, Charles M. Kelly, Harry W. Sharp, instructors.

St. Cloud State College: Arthur Housman, professor; Donald N. Dedmon, associate professor.

St. Louis University: Charles P. Paterson, associate professor; Barbara Seelye, assistant professor.

San Francisco State College: Jules Irving, professor; James Thompson, associate professor; George Armstrong, John Martin, assistant professors.

Temple University: Paul E. Randall, professor.

University of Arkansas: Mary E. Davis, assistant professor.

University of California: Don Geiger, department chairman.

University of Colorado: Charles Goetzinger, Albert H. Nadeau, associate professors.

University of Denver: Johnnye Akin, professor.

University of Hawaii: Elizabeth B. Carr, professor; Lloyd R. Newcomer, associate professor; Helen M. Lewis, assistant professor.

University of Iowa: Samuel L. Becker, professor.

University of Michigan: Claribel Baird, professor; Herbert W. Hildebrandt, Ronald S. Tikofsky, assistant professors; Robert Hall, Albert Katz, Donald Lovell, Roger Sherman, instructors.

University of Minnesota: Ernest Bormann, associate professor; George L. Shapiro, assistant professor.

University of Southern California: Janet Bolton, associate professor.

University of Washington: Wilma H. Grimes, associate professor.

University of Wisconsin: James W. Cleary, Jerry C. McNeely, associate professors; Thomas Murray, Lois Nelson, assistant professors.

Wayne State University: Marvin L. Esch, associate professor.

Leaves

Clarion College: Henry Giskin.

Humboldt State College: Clyde L. Rousey will be at the Menninger Clinic for a post-doctoral research study sponsored by the United States Department of Public Health.

Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia: George R. R. Pflaum, retired this spring from the department chairmanship, is on a sabbatical leave fall semester.

Northeastern Oklahoma State College: Louise Peake and Ruth Arrington have been granted leaves to continue graduate study.

Northwestern University: Wallace A. Bacon has accepted a Fulbright grant to serve as a lecturer in speech and drama at the University of the Philippines.

Purdue University: Joseph G. Stockdale will be on leave to serve as acting head of theatre at Williams College.

Southeastern Louisiana College: Lynn F. Kluth will be on leave of absence to continue graduate work at Louisiana State University.

Texas College of Arts and Industries: Keith Kennedy will be on leave to study at the University of Florida. James Palmer will serve as technical director of the theatre in his absence.

University of Arkansas: Ralph T. Eubanks is on leave to complete research at the Library of Congress and at the Carolinian Library of the University of South Carolina for a biography of the antebellum South Carolina orator, William Campbell Preston. Norman DeMarco is at the Electronics Music Center at Columbia University writing a drama with electronic music accompaniment. He will be at the University of Utrecht, Holland, this winter completing his work.

University of Colorado: Robley D. Rhine has been granted leave to do graduate work at the University of Wisconsin.

University of Hawaii: James R. Linn is spending his sabbatical year studying in London.

University of Miami: Sydney W. Head is spending the year in Europe working in professional radio-television broadcasting. In his absence Roy J. Johnson will serve as director of the division of communications services and Paul Nagel, Jr., as acting chairman of the radio-TV-film department.

University of Minnesota: Robert Moulton has been granted a sabbatical leave to study theatre production in Scandinavia.

University of North Dakota: Henry G. Lee will be studying at Tulane University this year.

University of Southern California: Forrest L. Seal is on a sabbatical leave this fall semester.

University of Wisconsin: Claude S. Hayes, Jerry C. McNeely, and James W. Cleary were on research leave this summer.

Back from Leave

Columbia University, Teachers College: Paul Kozelka was on leave spring semester to travel in Europe. While in London, he delivered a lecture on "The Teaching of Theatre in American Universities" at the American Embassy.

Illinois State Normal University: Mabel Clare Allen, after a six-month leave during which she toured ten European capitals.

Louisiana State University: Claude L. Shaver, after a year in Hong Kong under the Smith-Mundt Bill supervising the teaching of English in several Chinese colleges.

University of Arkansas: H. Preston Magruder has returned from a leave which included a tour of several European countries to study theatre design. Eleanor King is back after a year's leave in Japan where she taught in American Cultural Centers in thirteen cities.

University of Colorado: Mary Margaret Robb has returned from working on a research project at the University of Iowa.

University of Hawaii: Merle Ansberry, after a sabbatical visiting speech and hearing clinics throughout the United States and Canada.

University of Houston: Auley B. Luke, after two years studying at the University of Oklahoma.

University of Iowa: Margaret Hall returns after teaching the past year at the University of Bristol, England.

University of Kansas: E. C. Buehler, after a sabbatical year.

University of Minnesota, Duluth: Fred Meitzer, after a year's study at Ohio State University.

University of Missouri: Loren Reid, after teaching for the University of Maryland's Overseas Division in London for the past year—see "On Studying Abroad," *supra*.

University of Nebraska: Lucile Cypreansen had a summer's leave during which she travelled and studied in Europe.

Grants

A machine designed to make a person's speech more intelligible or to erase an accent is being developed at Ohio State University. John W. Black, who is supervising the project financed by a grant from the National Institutes of Health, calls it an "acoustic teaching machine." The machine provides subjects with verbal stimuli presenting problems of gradually increasing difficulty and immediate reward for correct responses. Although initial use of the machine has given promising results, the gathering of data for the quantifying of results has just begun.

The department at Purdue University has announced grants for students in industrial communication by Avon Cosmetics, Conrad Hilton Hotels, Montgomery Ward, General Electric, General Motors, and the National Brotherhood of Painters.

A hundred children will participate during the next year in a University of Iowa study of learning from educational television. The study is being directed by Samuel Becker and is supported by a federal grant.

Research grants to members of the speech faculty at the University of Kansas have been announced: Kim Giffin, "A Study of Discussion Techniques in Business and Professional Groups"; Frank E. X. Dance, Wilmer A. Linkugel, and Charles Sidman (history), "A Rhetorical-Historical Critique of the Speeches and Speaking of Adolph Hitler"; Mr. Dance, Mr. Linkugel, and Austin Lashbrook (Latin), "A Translation with Notes of Traversagni's *Nova Rhetorica*"; Mr. Dance, "The 'Maturity' Concept as it Relates to an Individual's Speech."

A grant of $73,000 has been made to the University of Pittsburgh's department by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for the purpose of strengthening the training program in speech pathology and audiology. Part of the money will be used to provide stipends for twenty graduate assistants.

Retirements

Allen Crafton retired in June after thirty-eight years at the University of Kansas. Mr. Crafton was graduated from Knox College in 1912. After receiving his master's degree from Harvard in 1914, he spent a year there as an assistant to George Pierce Baker. He taught at Wabash College and Carleton College before going to Kansas in 1923, where he reorganized the department of speech and drama and served as chairman for thirty-three years. Alumni and friends have created an "Allen Crafton Scholarship Fund" in his honor.

Alvina Krause has retired as associate professor of dramatic production at Northwestern University. She will continue as a lecturer at the university although she has added "emerita" to her title.

Herold Truslow Ross retired at DePauw University in July. He has been a member of the DePauw faculty since 1927 and chairman of the department of speech since 1936. As emeritus professor he will continue to teach part-time, however; he will also continue to serve on the Indiana State Superintendent's Committee on Educational Television and as a member of the Association of College Honor Societies. Mr. Ross, national president of Delta Sigma Rho, expects to have time now to finish two textbooks.

After a half-century of teaching speech, Andrew T. Weaver retired this spring at the University of Wisconsin. He was graduated from Carroll College, where he was Alfred Lunt's roommate. ("Don't get me started on Alfred, or I'll talk about him all afternoon. At Carroll I had the chance to play two leading parts—Richelieu and Petruchio—only because Alfred was away.") He then went to the University of Wisconsin, where he received a master's degree in 1911. He taught at Tome School in Maryland (with the title of "Master of Public Speaking"), Dartmouth, and Whitewater State College before returning to Wisconsin as a faculty member in 1917. He received his Ph.D. degree in psychology at Wisconsin in 1923 and was chairman of the department from 1927 to 1954. He has seen the department grow from five full-time faculty members offering 61 credits of work in 1918 to twenty-one full-time faculty offering 252 credits in 1961. "I belong to the generation concerned with all phases of our field—drama, oratory, debate, radio and television, voice science, the psychology and physiology of speech, and speech correction," he declares.

Mr. Weaver is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Sigma Rho, Alpha Kappa Psi, and Phi Kappa Phi. He is a past president of SAA (1927) and former editor of *QJS* (1930-32). Carroll College awarded him an honorary LL.D. degree in 1946. He was honored at a tea given by Wisconsin speech faculty members and graduate students in December, 1960, and on May 20 over 200 guests, including Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontanne, attended his retirement banquet in Madison.

"For upwards of fifty years, Professor Weaver has been schoolmaster to an entire profession," Frederick W. Haberman, chairman of the speech department at Wisconsin, says of him. "More than any man in our century, he encompasses the whole field of speech." Delta Sigma Rho cited him as a "pioneer and stalwart in the speech profession," for his many scholarly articles and books, his teaching, and speeches which have earned for him "respect and renown accorded only to the few."

Summer Theatre

Adelphi College: *The Bad Seed*; *Look Back in Anger*; *Blue Denim*; *Look Homeward, Angel*; *The Undercover Lover* (an original musical).

Columbia College: *Awake and Sing.*

Kendall College: *The Broken Jug.*

Kent State University: *Stalag 17.*

Lamar State College: *Say Darling*; *Bell, Book and Candle.*

Louisiana State University: *Waiting for Godot, The Importance of Being Earnest.*

Occidental College: *Dark of the Moon, St. Joan, Winter's Tale, Ruddigore* (all produced out-of-doors).

Purdue University: *The Marriage-Go-Round, The Dark at the Top of the Stairs, Two for the Seesaw, Charley's Aunt.*

Queens College: *Death of a Salesman, The Time of Your Life, The Glass Menagerie.*

St. Cloud State College: (at the Theatre L'Homme Dieu, Alexandria, Minnesota) *See How They Run, The Matchmaker, Night Must Fall, The Reluctant Debutante, My Three Angels, Bus Stop, Blithe Spirit, Diary of Anne Frank, The Male Animal, Charley's Aunt.*

University of Colorado: *Annie Get Your Gun, The Beggar's Opera,* in cooperation with the school of music; *Henry V, King Lear, Love's Labour's Lost*—Fourth Annual Shakespeare Festival.

University of Houston: *Comical Errors in Tombstone* (the actors improvised dialogue for a plot and characters).

University of Iowa: (in repertory) *Macbeth, School for Scandal, The Doctor's Dilemma, The Skin of Our Teeth.*

University of Maryland: *The Boy Friend, The Innocents, Epitaph for George Dillon, The Imaginary Invalid, The Gazebo.*

University of Michigan: *J.B., My Three Angels, The Bedbug, Rashomon, The Marriage of Figaro.*

University of Minnesota: *The Snob, The Copperhead,* and (on the Centennial Showboat) *Bloomer Girl.*

University of Missouri: (The Starlight Theatre—indoors after twelve years on the roof of the Laboratory School, but in a new air conditioned University Theatre), *Charley's Aunt* and *The Mousetrap.*

University of Nebraska: *The Lesson* and *A Little Winter Love* (an original play).

University of Wisconsin: *A View from the Bridge, Romanoff and Juliet, Summer and Smoke, Charley's Aunt, The Contrast* (an experimental laboratory production).

Theatre Notes

The new editorial office of *Player's Magazine* is the Department of Speech and Drama, University of Kansas, Lawrence. Gordon Beck and William L. Kuhlke, both of the Kansas Department, are now editor and business manager of the periodical.

Virgil Baker's Production of New Plays Seminar, University of Arkansas, did four new scripts this spring semester. Since the inception of the seminar in 1955, thirty new plays have been produced.

An Indian play, still running off-Broadway at ST's deadline, is under the direction of Krishna Shah, who received a master's degree from the University of Iowa in 1960. Shah directed the play, *The King of the Dark Chamber* by Rabindranath Tagore, when he was at Iowa.

At the University of Pittsburgh a new theatre group, University Players, has been organized. The group, which hopes to increase the general recognition of dramatic activities and students, produced three plays last year.

Sir Tyrone Guthrie spent a week in June on the University of Minnesota campus. In addition to speaking to theatre classes, he gave a public lecture and directed scenes from *Oedipus Rex,* allowing public attendance at rehearsals.

William Saroyan, Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright, and Howard Bay, professional designer and theatre lighting expert, will be

artists in residence at Purdue this year. Mr. Saroyan will produce a play, writing and directing the actors simultaneously. This experiment will be similar to that done by him last year in The Theater Royal, London, when he created *Sam, the Highest Jumper of Them All.* In addition, he will give several public lectures on playwriting and contemporary theatre. During the second semester, Mr. Bay will conduct seminars in scene design and give four public lectures.

The North Central Theatre Association will meet on the campus of Mankato State College (Minnesota) November 10 and 11.

Reading Hours

In May the Illini Readers held an interpretation workshop on the campus of the University of Illinois. Thirty-two students and eleven faculty members from seven colleges participated; the students interpreted the poetry of Yeats, Eliot and Frost, while the faculty members served as critics and discussion leaders. Another workshop in the interpretation of modern poetry is being planned for next spring. Other activities of the Illini Readers under the direction of Thomas O. Sloan during the past year included an evening of selections from the poetry and plays of Lorca, a weekly radio program, and a chamber theatre production of Edith Wharton's *Roman Fever.*

Under the supervision of Frances McCurdy, students at the University of Missouri presented "Readings for a Summer Evening," featuring the work of Negro poets and playwrights. A Readers Theatre production of "Peer Gynt" is planned for this fall semester.

Readers Theatre productions of Eliot's *The Wasteland* and *Sweeney Agonistes* under the direction of Janet Bolton played to capacity audiences at the University of Southern California in May.

Radio-Television

Three items of interest from American University: (1) Plans are being made for the sign-on of WAMU-FM during the week of October 23; (2) Twenty American University students of broadcasting spent parts of several days at the Federal Communications Commission helping analyze the mail which was received in response to the "Vast Wasteland" speech by Chairman Newton Minow to the National Association of Educational Broadcasters; (3) The Maryland-D.C. Broadcasters' Association has established a $500 scholarship for a student of broadcasting at American.

Anne Torrans, Auburn University, presented an educational television series entitled "Great American Speeches" during the summer. Members of the speech faculty taped excerpts from twenty speeches which Miss Torrans discussed on the program.

Chico State College will begin the use of closed circuit television during the fall semester to facilitate the teaching of multiple section classes. Garrett Starmer will coordinate the television program.

Philip A. Macomber, Kent State University, spent the spring and summer conducting an investigation concerning potential uses of closed circuit television on that campus.

The presentation of a $1500 award by the Broadcast Advertising Club of Chicago to Northwestern University to assist undergraduate students in broadcasting has been announced by Charles F. Hunter, chairman of Radio, Television and Film at Northwestern.

Peter D. Arnott, professor of drama and classics at the University of Iowa, recently completed a thirty-minute color film, *The Creation of Volpone.* The film was produced by the Television Center and will be available for television and film showings. The Center will continue to produce a monthly program entitled *Expedition Iowa* for the local ABC-TV network outlet.

A University of Michigan television series entitled "Speak Up" has just been completed. The fifteen half-hour programs dealt with problems which develop in handling meetings, committees, planning programs, and techniques of speaking, thinking and listening. Guests of host N. Edd Miller, Michigan, were: William S. Howell, University of Minnesota; Murray Hewgill and Clyde Dow, Michigan State University; Keith Brooks and Harold Harding, Ohio State University; Hugo Hellman, Marquette University; Carroll Arnold, Cornell University; Rupert Cortright, Wayne State University; Wilbur Moore, Central Michigan University; James McBurney, Northwestern University; J. Jeffery Auer, Indiana University; and Alvin Zander and William Sattler, University of Michigan.

The University of Missouri began microwaving programs this fall from its campus studios to its commercial station, KOMU-TV, for broadcast through central Missouri. Sixteen classrooms seating 630 students are now equipped to receive closed circuit television.

Completion of facilities in the new Arts and Sciences building will bring the capacity for closed circuit reception to 1250 students in thirty-four classrooms.

Kenneth Harwood, University of Southern California, has announced the publication of *Radio and Television Holdings of the University Library*. This reference work, which lists more than 1,700 items, may be ordered from the Library Photo-duplication Service of the university—$7.28 for an unbound Xerex copy and $2.35 for a microfilm copy. Mr. Harwood, who hopes that other libraries will publish copies of their radio-television holdings, explains that "a Xerex print of more than 100 pages is made from microfilm #3688, with approximately seventeen entries to the page; the microfilm is made by photographing the upper part of each catalogue card."

Programs for Business and Industry

Milton Dobkin conducted a special executive training workshop for executives of the Bank of America at Humboldt College.

Gale L. Richards was a member of the faculty of the Summer Session Workshop held for supervisory personnel of the Santa Fe Railroad at the University of Southern California.

At the University of Illinois five members of the speech department cooperated with the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations in giving short summer courses for labor groups: Ted J. Barnes; Halbert E. Gulley; Hugh P. Munro; Richard Murphy; Thomas O. Sloan.

During the summer, several special programs were conducted at the University of Kansas. E. C. Buehler taught two classes in oral communication for the Fifteenth Annual Institute of the AFL-CIO Steelworkers Union; William A. Conboy and Frank E. X. Dance conducted a three month oral communications course for Owens-Corning Fiberglas Company; and Kim Giffin, Mr. Dance, Mr. Buehler, and Mr. Conboy participated in a one week course for the Associated Credit Bureaus of America Midwest Management Institute.

Lionel Crocker, Denison University, and William Sattler, University of Michigan, taught in the Public Utility Executive Program conducted by the School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, this summer.

William S. Tacey, University of Pittsburgh, presented a series of lectures on parliamentary procedure for officers and members of Pittsburgh locals of the United Steel Workers and the Fire Fighters unions.

Buildings

During the summer, the Playhouse Theatre at Allegheny College underwent an extensive face lifting. The renovation includes new seating, new lighting and sound system, and remodeling the stage to permit more flexible staging. The small Theatre Upstairs, seating fifty-three, has been redecorated in a Comedia dell' Arte motif. The work was directed by John W. Hulbert, department chairman.

The Joe E. Brown Theatre, an intimate, experimental theatre of flexible design, has been completed at Bowling Green University. Equipped to permit proscenium staging, arena staging, period staging, and non-realistic experimentation, it will seat from 250 to 350 depending on the staging used. The new facilities include a scene shop, makeup rooms, light and sound workrooms, and properties storage. The new air-conditioned plant will place Bowling Green theatre operations in one place, since the main auditorium is adjacent.

The Department of Speech and Drama at Cornell University is now housed in newly renovated Lincoln Hall. This building, shared with the Department of Music, brings all speech and drama facilities, except the University Theatre, under a single roof. The Drummond Studio, a new experimental theatre with seating for one hundred persons, will allow proscenium staging, arena, and other free-staging arrangements. Adjacent are light control and motion picture projection booths, production rooms, a technical theatre classroom and laboratory, and offices. Four flexible classrooms are interconnected by public address lines through a central recording-listening studio. The Winans Room, a forensics auditorium seating about fifty persons, and two seminar rooms round out the complement of classroom spaces for general and public use. The division of speech behavior and pathologies is assigned four sound-treated office-consultation rooms and two diagnostic-therapy rooms with one-way mirror connections to adjoining observation areas. Also in the new accommodations are a "silent room" and control booth equipped with apparatus for audiometric, electrodermal, and delayed-feedback experimentation.

The School of Speech at Kent State University dedicated facilities in the new Music and Speech Centers, May 13. H. Clay Harshbarger,

University of Iowa, gave the dedicatory address. The first performance, *The Dark at the Top of the Stairs,* in the E. Turner Stump Theatre was presented that evening.

A 522 seat theatre is under construction at Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Texas. The theatre, with a large wrap-around stage deep enough to permit the staging of arena theatre productions in back of the closed front curtain, should be ready for use by September, 1962.

"A new complex of buildings for a Communication Center" at the University of Denver is planned for completion in about two years. "In the meantime, following a fire in Temporary 8, on July 12, the School of Speech has been consolidated in space adjoining the Speech Clinic and Audiological Center."

A drive for funds to construct a new theatre at the University of North Dakota has begun with a $100,000 gift by Mrs. O. B. Burtness in memory of her husband, O. B. Burtness, a North Dakota alumnus who served in the United States Congress and later as a federal district judge. John Penn, department chairman, indicates spring as the goal for beginning construction.

Curricula

Adelphi College has established a program leading to the Masters Degree in theatre arts.

Three courses in radio-television have been added to the curriculum at Bowling Green State University—television speaking, radio production-direction, and introduction to radio announcing.

George Washington University has announced the establishment this fall of a program of study in cooperation with Arena Stage, Washington's resident repertory theatre, leading to the degree of Master of Arts in Dramatic Art. The program will require two years of work at Arena Stage and the University.

Illinois State Normal University has added a new sequence of graduate courses in theatre. Eight new courses will be offered in British and American drama, history of scene design, advanced costume and make-up, and dramatic criticism.

The New Jersey state board has authorized Paterson State College to offer a speech arts major for the bachelors degree. The department had been offering only a major in speech correction.

The following courses have been added to the graduate catalogue at the University of Arkansas: ancient and medieval rhetoric, modern rhetoric, British public address, and speech composition.

The Chicago Undegraduate Division, University of Illinois, is now offering two noncredit courses for foreign students with speech difficulties. The courses are under the direction of Conde Hoskins.

Two new courses in public address are now being offered at the University of Pittsburgh: speech in a free society, and analysis and evaluation of propositions of policy.

Ross Scanlan, 1902-1961

On the afternoon of April 15, 1961, Ross Scanlan, Professor of Speech, City College, was chatting with colleagues at a meeting of the Speech Association of the Eastern States in Hotel Hudson, New York. He was in his usual high spirits and apparent good health, cheering his many friends with his presence, his stories, and his unforgettable voice. A half-hour later, about to return home in a train of the Pennsylvania Railroad, he suffered a heart attack and apparently died instantly. He was fifty-nine years old.

Ross Scanlan was born in Albany, New York, on March 20, 1902. He spent his boyhood in Buffalo, where his father was a newspaper editor. He received an A.B. degree from Cornell in 1925. He received an M.A. from the University of Pittsburgh in 1927, and a Ph.D. from Cornell in 1937. He taught speech at the University of Pittsburgh, Washington University, Cornell, and Dartmouth, before coming to the College as a Tutor in 1934.

The range of his interest and ability in the various fields of speech was uncommonly broad. He was trained and could perform and teach in the fields of theatre, rhetoric, public address, discussion, debate, and voice and articulation. His published articles in scholarly journals reveal this breadth of interest and competence. With Professor Lester Thonssen he was the co-author of a textbook, *Speech Preparation and Delivery* (1941). His concern with discussion and public address led him to investigations in the areas of social psychology and mass persuasion. His doctoral dissertation was a study of Nazi propaganda and propaganda methods, and this remained a continuing interest.

Solid and dependable, painstaking and conscientious in the discharge of his obligations and duties, he also possessed a flashing wit,

which illumined his contacts with his colleagues and won him friends throughout the College, and, indeed, throughout the world. Most recently he had extended his chain of friendships across the Pacific Ocean to Hawaii, where he was an exchange professor during the year 1959-1960. He was respected for his scholarship, his skill as a teacher, his devotion to his students and the College, and he was loved for his warmth of personality, his unfailing good humor, and his infectious sense of the absurd. Some of us knew, too, the nobility and courage which had enabled him to meet deep personal tragedies in his own life gallantly and bravely.

Professor Scanlan's services to *QJS* were long and extensive. From 1928 he contributed book reviews and articles. He had been an associate editor of the journal since 1960, a position he also held 1951-1956.

ROBERT SONKIN
The City College, New York

Matthew Rigler, who had been director of the Speech Improvement Laboratory of the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois, since 1953, died at his home at the age of forty on November 14, 1960. Mr. Rigler, who received his B.S. and M.S. degrees at the University of Illinois, Urbana, taught in the Paxton, Illinois, public schools before assuming his duties at the Chicago Undergraduate Division.

William W. Fletcher, Associate Professor of Speech, University of Minnesota, was killed in an automobile accident in Minneapolis, August 17. Mr. Fletcher, forty-two years of age, came to Minnesota to teach voice science and phonetics in 1952 from Northwestern University where he had just completed his Ph.D. degree. He received his A.B. and M.A. degrees from the University of Washington.

PERSONALS

Thomas B. Abbott, Baylor University, spent July and August visiting speech and hearing clinics.

A. Craig Baird, professor emeritus, University of Iowa, will teach courses in speech criticism and in American public address at Iowa this fall. The first semester of last year he was at the University of Illinois, and the second semester at the University of Missouri. On May 4, at Columbia, Missouri, in a ceremony sponsored by the department of speech, and by the University of Missouri Press, he was formally presented with a copy of *American Public Address—Studies in Honor of Albert Craig Baird,* edited by Loren Reid.

The College of Arts and Sciences, University of Washington, announces that Barnet Baskerville has been appointed director of the honors program.

Earl W. Blank, Northwestern State College, Oklahoma, directed a special education workshop and initiated a reading clinic at the Oklahoma College for Women this summer.

O. G. Brockett, University of Iowa, has published an article entitled "The Theater of the Southern United States from the Beginnings through 1865: A Bibliographical Essay" in *Theater Research-Recherches Theatrales,* a bilingual publication of the International Federation for Theater Research.

The field of speech was represented in the Tenth Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu, August 21-September 6, by Elizabeth Carr, University of Hawaii, who read a paper on the bilingual speaker in Hawaii.

Hayden K. Carruth has been named Assistant Dean for Academic Counselling at the University of Michigan.

Martin Cobin has resigned from the University of Illinois to become Associate Professor of Speech, University of Colorado. He will direct the department's program of research in radio and television.

Esther Eby, University of Houston, visited Europe this summer as director of an American Express Tour.

Ralph Eubanks' commencement address, "Know Thy Worth," delivered at the University of Arkansas High School, was published in the July 15 issue of *Vital Speeches.*

The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness of the United States Department of Public Health has awarded a three year post-doctoral research fellowship to Victor Garwood, University of Southern California.

Don Geiger is now chairman of the department at the University of California. Jacobus tenBroek has resigned to become chairman of the California State Welfare Board.

The University of Wisconsin Press has just published *Old Gentlemen's Convention: The Washington Peace Conference of 1861* by Robert G. Gunderson, Indiana University, *QJS* book review editor.

Ruth R. Haun was among those honored in May for long service at the University of Pittsburgh. She received a twenty-year pin.

At a banquet in May, the faculty of Marquette University School of Speech honored Hugo Hellman for twenty-five years of service.

John P. Hoshor, University of Hawaii, received grants which permitted him to attend the Seventh Annual Training Laboratory in Individual Behavior at Jemez Springs, New Mexico, June 11-23.

George Kernodle, University of Arkansas, lectured on "Theatre for the Lonely Man" at the Summer Festival of Art program at Louisiana State University in June.

An Oberlin College faculty foreign travel fellowship enabled Jerome B. Landfield to spend ten weeks in Great Britain and western Europe this summer studying dramatic arts and attending theatrical productions.

Theodor LeVander, Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois, was awarded the Distinguished Alumni Citation by his alma mater, Gustavus Adolphus College, at its commencement banquet in June.

James H. McBurney, Northwestern University, and Bernard B. Schlanger, West Virginia University, were outside examiners for the speech comprehensive examinations at Denison University in June.

Sumi McCabe and Melba Leong Kop, University of Hawaii, have been appointed to teach courses in the new East-West Center at the University. The Center draws its students from Asian countries and the Pacific Islands.

William B. McCoard has been appointed chairman of the department at the University of Southern California. Milton Dickens remains chairman of the Division of Communications.

Cornell University Press has published *The Commonwealth Pen*, edited by Alan L. McLeod, State University of New York College of Education, Fredonia.

The Joke and the Valley by Jerry C. McNeely, University of Wisconsin, was awarded the $3,500 first prize in a Hallmark Teleplay Writing Competition. The play was produced on Hallmark Hall of Fame in May starring Dean Stockwell, Thomas Mitchell, and Keenan Wynn.

Jack Matthews, University of Pittsburgh, presented two lectures for the All University Lectures, University of Wisconsin, and two for the speech department at the University of Nebraska in March.

Richard Moody, Indiana University, received the Distinguished Service Award from his alma mater at Drake University Founders Day Convocation, May 8.

Elbert R. Moses, Jr., Clarion State College, was named by the University of Pittsburgh, Office of Cultural Affairs, as a participant in an international exchange seminar with the Netherlands Universities Foundation in The Hague, August 2-9.

Each year a distinguished member of the University of Denver faculty is selected for the annual University Lecture. On April 18, Elwood Murray lectured on "Corridors Among the Ivory Towers" to more than 800 who attended. This summer Mr. Murray flew over the Rocky Mountains five times to give a Laboratory on Interpersonal Communication at Mesa College, Grand Junction, Colorado.

W. Charles Redding spent the summer in research on a study of "Human Communication and Organization Theory," working under a grant from the Purdue Research Foundation.

Thomas R. Nilsen and Walter W. Stevens, University of Washington, received grants from the University for summer research projects.

Joseph Stewart, University of Denver, enrolled in the second International Conference on Paedo-Audiology at the University of Groningen, Netherlands, June 13-16.

George M. Stokes has left the Baylor University speech department to become executive secretary of the Baylor Ex-Students Association.

William S. Tacey, University of Pittsburgh, as retiring chairman of the Assembly of State and Regional Conferences, AAUP, has begun a second two-year term on the Assembly's Executive Committee.

C. Raymond Van Dusen has resigned as chairman of the department at the University of Miami to become coordinator of basic studies at Brevard College, Cocoa, Florida.

Harry L. Weinberg, Temple University, lectured on the "Values of a Negative Meta-Linguistic System" at the Twelfth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies at the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University in April.

Robert West, Brooklyn College, spoke at a special symposium on stuttering sponsored by North Dakota State College, Fargo, in April.

Melvin R. White, Brooklyn College, was appointed to the Executive Committee of the United States Institute for Theatre Technology and chairman of its Committee on Theatre Administration.